The
Catholic Historical Review

VOLUME V JANUARY, 1920 NUMBER 4

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN AMERICA IN 1819

A CONTEMPORARY ACCOUNT

In Washington, at the Catholic University, on February 20, 1919, before eighty bishops assembled to do honor to the illustrious Cardinal Gibbons, His Eminence Cardinal O'Connell in a striking phrase spoke of "the unimaginable transition from the infant church of Maryland to the giant church of America." In this period of reconstruction, we are accustoming ourselves more and more to attempt to see what is beyond tomorrow, and less and less to remembering what was before yesterday. Yet one important element in what is and is to be, is what was, for our corporate life holds in itself in effect all that it has lived; and reconstruction without tradition is unintelligent. There was another period in our history when it seemed that an age was over and another just beginning, and when men with imagination were wondering to themselves what the Church was to be in the coming century, a hundred years ago. We, who, in a sense, are where they were, may find inspiration in seeing just what they were, and fortunately we possess contemporary accounts in the writings of Kohlmann, England, Maréchal, Dzierozynski, Flaget and Grassi, of their position, their problems, difficulties and fears. The account of the last named writer may prove most interesting as being from the viewpoint of an outsider, who yet took an intimate part in church development during the years 1810–1817, and who wrote his memoir, "Notizie Varie" in Milan in 1818.[1]

[1] GIOVANNI GRASSI, S.J., *Notizie varie sullo stato presente della Repubblica degli Stati Uniti d'America settentrionale, scritte al principio del 1818.* Ed. 2. Milano par Giovanni Silvestro, MDCCXIX. (Georgetown University, Riggs Library, *Shea Collection*, 162.73.) Part of the work appeared in translation in the American Catholic Historical Society *Researches*, vol. viii, pp, 98-111, taken from the *Woodstock Letters*, vol. xi., No. 3.

John Anthony Grassi was one of those European Jesuits who played a great part in helping the expansion of the Church and of the Society in America after its restoration, and the story of his coming here is interesting and typical.[2]

Father Louis Poirot, the last of the old Jesuit missionaries in China, musician to the Court of Pekin, wrote with his dying hand to the Pope asking for a successor. The Holy Father sent the petition on to Father General Gruber, who immediately ordered Fathers Korsack and Grassi to come to him at Petersburg with mathematical, physical and astronomical books. Father Grassi, who was born at Bergamo, September 10, 1775.[3] and had been a novice at Colorno under the Ven. Joseph Pignatelli, set out with his companion from Polocz, where he had been preparing for the Armenian mission at Astrakhan on the Caspian Sea. Once with the General they received their orders, and then began, in February, 1805, a strange Odyssey that was to last five years and end, not in Pekin but in Baltimore. Through Russia and Finland, they crossed the frozen sea to Aland Island, over the Gulf of Bothnia to Sweden and Stockholm; then to Copenhagen, by a change of plans. Again a disappointment, and they crossed a stormy winter sea to London. From here they were sent to Lisbon, and they stopped off at Cork on the way. At Lisbon they tarried long, after a new disappointment, waited for orders from Russia, and studied astronomy there and at Coimbra. We pass over all their attempts and failures to get a ship, and find them once more in England in November, 1807, to make another effort to set sail, and meanwhile to study more astronomy in London. Then came orders to go back to Russia to make a new attempt by way of Tartary, only to be followed by others soon after assigning Grassi to the mission of Maryland, just then in pressing need of men. He sailed from Liverpool on August 27, 1810, landed in Baltimore on October 20, and went straight on to Georgetown. The Maryland mission at this time was in a state of transition from the older regime, and on October 16, 1811, Grassi at the age of thirty-three, was named Superior, and Rector

[2] *Woodstock Letters*, Vol. iv, pp. 114 sq.

[3] And not, as stated in ACHS *Researches*, *l.c.*, October 12, 1778, where he is confounded with Nicholas Grassi, who entered the same day, November 16, 1779, *Catal. Prov. Ital, S. J.*, 1829.

of Georgetown by the General, who passed over Kohlmann "on account of his important labors in New York."[4]

Grassi did very much to "revive" Georgetown, to use Carroll's phrase; it was during his administration that President Madison signed the Act of Congress (1815), raising the college to the rank of a University. He remained in his position of Superior of the mission until July, 1817, when he left for Europe on business for the Society and for Archbishop Neale. He was never to return. He published his *Notizie* at Milan in 1818, and a second edition appeared the following year.

It is a fair-sized book of 146 pages and is divided into three parts: *Notizie varie* (pp. 1-59), on the climate, soil, products, commerce, population, characters, costume, literature and government; on the various sects in the states (pp. 60-110); and on the present state of the Catholic religion, (pp. 111-146), under two headings, *Diocesses* and *Churches and functions*. Annexed to the volume is a double-page statistical table giving, in parallel columns, the names of states with latitude and longitude, area in square miles, products, minerals, population in 1790 and in 1810, inhabitants per square miles, capital and principal cities with respective population, universities and colleges, and number of representatives in Congress, an imposing array, showing that he had made full and sympathetic use of his time here in America.

What was the position of the Church as he saw it here a century ago? As is well known, the Province of Baltimore embraced the sees of Baltimore (1789) and the newly erected sees (1808) of Philadelphia, New York, Boston and Bardstown. New Orleans, which was added in 1803, had been founded in 1793, and its first Bishop was Peñalver y Cardenas; Charleston and Richmond were not to follow until 1820, and Cincinnati in 1821. Archbishop Carroll had died in 1815; Leonard Neale had succeeded, and died in 1817, and Ambrose Maréchal, (1764-1828) was now archbishop. The Diocese of Baltimore at this time comprised the states south and southwest of Maryland, and for this territory in 1818, there were 53 priests, of whom 24 were seculars, 20 were Jesuits, and 9 Sulpicians,[5]

[4] HUGHES, *Hist. of S.J. in N. A., Documents*, ii, 992, General, Rome, to Carroll, 20 Nov., 1811.

[5] Maréchal to Propaganda, HUGHES, *Docs.*, ii, 957, 959.

for a population estimated by Maréchal in 1821 to be 80,000. In Baltimore itself there were five churches, including the Seminary Church which, says Grassi, was "Gothic, but elegant." Washington had St. Patrick's and Holy Trinity at Georgetown, too small by two-thirds for the flock. Frederick had its church and one priest, Father Malevé, S.J., who traveled as far afield as Martinsburg and Cumberland. Norfolk and Alexandria had churches; Richmond, Petersburg and Fredericksburg had congregations but no churches. Charleston, S. C., and Augusta, Ga., had each a church and a priest; Savannah had 500 Catholics and a church but no priest,[6] North Carolina had congregations at Newbern and Washington, but no church until 1823.[7] Maryland also had churches and large congregations in Prince George's, Charles, St. Mary's and Cecil counties. The diocese of Philadelphia presents two distinct pictures: the four city churches, St. Joseph's, founded by Joseph Greaton, S.J., in 1734,[8] Holy Trinity (1789), St. Mary's (1763), and St. Augustine's, founded in 1796 by Matthew Carr, O.S.A.; and the outside missions, Conewago, with four Jesuits, Lancaster with one, Gosphenhoppen with two, Loretto in Cambria County, with the illustrious Father Gallitzin—in the whole diocese only thirteen priests for 30,000 people. Of course all these centers had dependent missions, *e.g.*, from Lancaster they went to Elizabethtown, Harrisburg and Chester, from Conewago to York and Carlisle and Westminster, Md.; Gallitzin had an even greater territory, while Father O'Brien at Pittsburg tended a district "equal to ten dioceses in Italy," said Felix de Andreis, on passing through in 1817.[9] New York was less well off. With an estimated Catholic population of more than 20,000 in 1818, "mostly Irish, whose attachment to the Faith is wonderful," says Grassi, there were two churches, St. Peter's in Barclay Street (1786), and old St. Patrick's, built by Father Kohlmann in 1809–10. Bishop Connolly, O.P., was laboring as a missionary priest almost alone here; he had only four priests, two of them very old. Albany had its St. Mary's Church, and one priest, who traveled all over western and central New

[6] England, *Works*, Vol. iii, *Hist. of Dioc. of Charleston*, pp. 246 sq. (Balto., 1849).
[7] *U. S. Catholic Miscellany*, Vol. ii, pp. 54, 96, 146.
[8] ACHS *Researches*, vol. xvi, p. 82.
[9] *U. S. Catholic Historical Magazine*, Vol. iii, p. 247.

York, and Utica received a priest and a church in 1819.[10] Outside of these there were no other churches, though many scattered Irish Catholics lived throughout the state. In the Empire State in 1819, the Church had everything yet to do. The real founder of the church in Boston was the Abbé Matignon in 1792, though Rev. C. F. Bouchard de la Poterie had opened a chapel in 1788 for 120 Catholics,[11] but it was soon afterwards suspended. It was now presided over by Bishop Cheverus, whose name is illustrious in our annals. He had only three priests for over 800 Catholics, and outside of Boston, only two churches, beside a few stations along the north and south shores. There was the Indian station at Pleasant Point on the Penobscot with one missionary, Father Ryan, and St. Patrick's at New Castle, Maine, in which state, at the constitutional convention of 1819, anti-Catholic legislation was averted and safely weathered by the prompt action of energetic Catholics.[12] In 1820 the first church was built; the year 1817 saw the first ordination, that of Dennis Ryan, and 1818 the holy death of Abbé Matignon.[13] It was Cheverus who in 1820 was to introduce the Ursulines to Boston, whence six years later they removed to Charlestown.

It is when we come to the West that we find interest and promise. Over those vast reaches very few missionaries traveled, but the very character of the enterprises in such a wilderness is what fires the imagination. Maryland was already old and well established as a Church and had only to carry out its normal development in an enlightened manner to realize its promise. New York and Boston had hardly begun. But the West was palpably growing, emigration had already started, and mere trading stations at a favorable spot on the Great River were in a few years to be cities. In 1808 there was one diocese, Bardstown; thirty years later the assembled bishops at Baltimore asked for an increase in dioceses that brought their total number west of the Alleghenies up to nineteen. There were in 1819 two centers of radiation; New Orleans and Bardstown. The Louisiana Purchase (1803) had brought 30,000 Catholics into the boundaries of the

[10] ZWIERLEIN, *Catholic beginnings in the Diocese of Rochester*, in the CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW, Vol. i, p. 284.

[11] *U. S. Catholic Historical Magazine*, Vol. iii, p. 314.

[12] ACHS *Researches*, Vol. ix, p. 159.

[13] SCANLAN, *Brief History of the Archdiocese of Boston* (Boston, 1908), pp. 23, 25.

United States, and after a vacancy of the See since 1802, the Sulpician, Louis W. Du Bourg, was made administrator by Carroll in 1812, and was consecrated Bishop of New Orleans on September 18, 1815, at Rome. In October, 1816, he sent 10 Ursulines from Bordeaux, and in May, 1817, he wrote to Propaganda that he was leaving France with 20 missionaries, having sent 13 more ahead, among them the Lazarists, Felix de Andreis and Joseph Rosati, later Bishop of St. Louis (1827)[14] which at this time was a struggling village. The diocese extended eight or nine hundred miles up the west bank of the Mississippi and was roughly divided into two parts: Upper and Lower Louisiana, in the former of which de Andreis was his Vicar-General. In 1819, Bishop Dubourg had five religious of the Sacred Heart, three of them of a rare talent for teaching.[15] Besides the local population, three separate emigrations of Acadians had come from Maryland from 1765–1767 where 900 of them had settled, and later the Catholic population was further to be increased by a migration of American Catholics from the same state.

Bishop Flaget, S.S., was the pioneer Bishop of Bardstown, and we have his own account of his diocese in a letter to Propaganda of 1815.[16] His diocese ran about 700 miles along the east bank of the Mississippi, and was almost as wide. His priests included four Dominicans, two Sulpicians and four others, among whom were Fathers Badin and Nerinckx, missionaries of long experience in that country. There were in all nine Catholic settlements in Kentucky, eight in Marion County, and one in Scott County, founded between the years 1785 and 1795, and where the Catholics remained close together, the Faith persevered under the ministrations of occasional priests who passed through or came and stayed short periods.[17] In 1819 the Catholic population numbered 10,000, and, to train his own priests, the bishop had begun a seminary in 1811, under Father John B. David, afterward his coadjutor. In both this nascent seminary and the Dominican priory he counted sixteen students

[14] HUGHES, *Docs.*, ii, pp. 1012, 1013, note.

[15] HUGHES, *Text*, ii, 549.

[16] CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW, Vol. i, pp. 305–319, with Fr. O'Daniel's illuminating notes.

[17] WEBB, *Centenary of Catholicity in Kentucky*, pp. 26 sq.

not yet ordained. He had nineteen churches, seven of them erected by Nerinckx. Ohio was then a missionary adjunct of Kentucky and held in all about fifty Catholic families. Its oldest church is St. Joseph's, near Somerset, Perry County, founded on December 6, 1818, by the Dominicans, Edward Fenwick and N. D. Young; they began with ten families and by 1824, there were one hundred and fifty.[18] It was this field that was to win for Edward Fenwick the title of Missionary of Ohio and the onerous post of first Bishop of Cincinnati (1822). In Indiana there was a station at Post-Vincennes, but no priest; in Illinois, three parishes and two priests, the parishes of St. Ann's at Detroit and of St. Anthony's at Raisin River, both under the famous Sulpician, Gabriel Richard, congressman and printer. The Indian missions in all those vast regions were most of them practically non-existent since the collapse of the Jesuit missions after the expulsion of the Society from all French territory in 1763.

In all this expansion since the small beginnings of colonial days, the religious orders played their part. The Jesuits, who in the designs of Providence were the pioneers of the Faith in the colonies and were alone on the scene in Maryland and Pennsylvania up to the Revolution, had 144 active missionaries there in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; and, besides from Canada, they labored from Maine to Detroit and from Louisiana up to the Illinois country, making in all 464 Jesuits working in North America in those two centuries.[19] In 1819 they attended 45 stations in Maryland and Pennsylvania, and two in New York, and cooperating with them in those places were twelve secular priests. Their only college, since closing up the New York school,[20] was Georgetown, which Grassi left flourishing. In 1823 they were to open a novitiate at Florissant, Mo., near St. Louis, the beginning of the present Missouri province. The Sulpicians, who had opened a seminary and college in Baltimore and a college at Emmitsburg, had 9 members in the diocese and in 1821 were educating 15 Seminarians, 87 in the *petit séminaire*, and 188 in the college in Baltimore; and in Bardstown Father

[18] *U. S. Catholic Miscellany*, Vol. ii, No. 11, pp. 164–5, 1824.
[19] Hughes, *Text*, ii, Appendix F, p. 704.
[20] Catholic Historical Review, April 1918, p. 48.

David, S.S., directed a college with 25 students and 12 seminarians. Of them Carroll had said in 1812: "Too much praise cannot be given by me to the priests of St. Sulpice here for their zeal and sacrifices to the public cause."[21] The Dominicans under E. D. Fenwick, O.P., had made their pioneer foundation at St. Rose s in Kentucky in 1806, and were teaching in the seminary and performing valiant missionary service in the surrounding states. The Lazarists, who had first come here in 1816, had 9 members here and had founded their first house at the Barrens, afterwards St. Mary's College and Seminary, and under their illustrious superior, Felix de Andreis (1778–1820), were performing the usual laborious missionary work, and having, besides, great success in evangelizing the Indians.[22] Communities of women were not wanting, too: the Carmelites (1790), at Port Tobacco; the Visitation nuns (1799), at Georgetown; the Sisters of Charity at Emmitsburg (1808) and New York (1817); the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth in Kentucky (1813), in which State Father Thomas Wilson, O.P., was to found a community of Sisters of the Third Order of St. Dominic near Springfield in 1822; the Ursulines in Boston (1820), New York (1812), and New Orleans (1727); and Father Nerinckx's community of Friends of Mary at the Foot of the Cross at Loretto in Kentucky (1812), were all doing splendid missionary and educational work. The outlook for vocations among women was bright, but among men not so encouraging, though the dark picture given by Benedict Fenwick, S.J., and Bishop Connolly is somewhat lightened by the optimistic words of Grassi. Fenwick wrote: "What can you do with, or expect from young hairbrained Americans . . . infatuated with the sound of liberty and equality?" "The American youth," adds Connolly, "have an almost invincible repugnance to the ecclesiastical state," yet Grassi says: "A fair number of excellent young men, native to the country, have already entered upon an ecclesiastical career."[23]

---

[21] HUGHES, *Docs.*, 994, Carroll to Plowden, England, January 27, 1812.

[22] *U. S. Catholic Historical Magazine*, Vol. i, pp. 233 sq. *Early Lazarist Missions and Missionaries.*

[23] Fenwick, N. Y., to Grassi, Georgetown, February 20, 1815, HUGHES, *Docs.*, i, p. 835, n. 60. Connolly, N. Y., to Propaganda in BAYLEY, *History of Catholic Church in N. Y.*, p. 92.

The nationality of the Catholic populations varied in different localities. In Baltimore they were mostly of English descent, with some Irish and Acadians; in Philadelphia, Germans and Irish; in New York and Boston, mostly Irish; in Kentucky the melting pot was already in operation. Most of these Catholics had brought their religion with them to this country, but Grassi and Kohlmann speak of converts, and hope of converts, especially among the Methodists. The Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798 threatened for a time, but the good sense and energy of Jefferson averted what was in reality a danger not only for religion but for the country itself. A more lasting danger was the trustee system, which was then beginning to show its ugly head.

Education does not seem to have grown apace with religious expansion, small as that may seem to us now. Georgetown, our first Catholic college, founded by Carroll in September, 1791, with Rev. Robert Plunkett as President (d. 1815), had in 1819 a staff of 11 professors and nearly 100 students, under the presidency of Anthony Kohlmann, S.J.[24] St. Mary's College, Baltimore, founded by the Sulpicians in 1799, and attached to the Seminary, had 20 instructors in 1819 and just less than 200 students. Mount St. Mary's, Emmitsburg, founded in 1808 by Father Dubois, S.S., with 7 students, had 60 students in 1805, and in 1818 was just emerging from a crisis that was only the prelude to a new life and a long and honorable career.[25] Kentucky boasted of two colleges, St. Joseph's at Bardstown, founded by Rev. George Elder in 1819, though classes were held in the basement of the Seminary until the first wing of the College was finished in 1820; and the second, St. Mary's near Lebanon, in Marion County, was just under way. Father Nerinckx secured a plot of land for it in 1820, and it was to be carried to a flourishing state by Rev. William Byrne, who in twelve years educated over 1,200 boys.[26].

Grassi, writing for Europeans, naturally takes a European viewpoint, and like other visitors to our shores is most impressed with the spirit of toleration both of the government

[24] Shea, *History of Georgetown College*, Washington, 1891, p. 54 sq.
[25] Herbermann, *Sulpicians in U. S., New York*, 1916, pp. 114, 131.
[26] Webb, *op. cit.*, pp. 276 and 282 sq.

and of the people, as soon as Catholics and Catholicism became familiar to them in their true light.

The value of his little work for historians lies not so much in presentations of new facts as in his general picture of contemporary missionary life, its difficulties and hopes for the future.

It is an interpretation for the Old World of the New as he saw it from the inside during his seven important years in this country. It helps a little more to realize what we are, and to nourish a fair hope that we may be one day as much greater than we now are, as now we are greater than the infant church of 1819.

Grassi's subsequent life was spent in important positions in the Society in Italy from 1821 as Rector of the College in Turin, and later as Rector of the College of Propaganda and assistant to the General for Italy in Rome, where he impressed George Ticknor, who met him there, as "a man of talent and education."

He died at Rome, December 12, 1849.

J. WILFRID PARSONS, S J.,
Rome, Italy.

BISHOP McQUAID OF ROCHESTER

HIS EPISCOPAL CAREER (1868–1902)

The beginnings of Bishop McQuaid's episcopate were not more promising of success than the early years of his life. Small as his diocese was with its thirty-nine priests, it was not too small for the brewing of more than ordinary trouble the very first year of its existence. The only other city in the diocese besides Rochester was the storm center. After a preliminary settlement of the O'Flaherty case in Auburn,[41] the storm broke out with renewed fury under the opposition of a small party of Malcontents that rallied about the removed and suspended pastor of the Church of the Holy Family. The church had to be closed until a great majority of the congregation organized to give the guarantee demanded by Bishop McQuaid for the maintenance of Catholic order and discipline. He was pleased finally to be able to communicate, April 8, 1869, his approval of a set of resolutions sent to him by these faithful Catholics.

> The resolutions at Markham Hall, in Auburn, on the first of April, signed then and afterwards by five hundred men (members of the parish of the Holy Family) are now before me.
>
> The language of the resolutions is the language of Catholics who know, acknowledge, and hold to the Faith and Discipline of the Catholic Church.
>
> That the Rev. Martin Kavanagh is not now living in that parish and attending to its spiritual wants is no fault of his, nor is it mine. He has been pastor of the church since the 15th day of February, but unable to enter on the discharge of his duties through the opposition, even to violence, of the Rev. Thomas O'Flaherty and his organized party of Malcontents.
>
> With great persistence they have maintained that this opposition was unanimous on the part of the congregation of the Holy Family. Telegraphic dispatches and newspaper reports have circulated this charge all over the country. Whence originated the dispatches and reports no one in Auburn needs to be told. It was the duty of the congregation thus calumniated to repel the calumny and justify their claim to the name of Catholic Congregation.
>
> Now that you have spoken and acted, and can no longer be misrepresented, I will request the Rev. Martin Kavanagh to return to Auburn, and I shall expect you to put him in possession of the Church and church-property, and to protect and maintain him in the peaceable exercise of his functions as Pastor of the Church of the Holy Family.
>
> If the misguided men who have made themselves conspicuous in the past weeks by their contempt for church discipline, disregard for the law, and loud and foul abuse of their Bishop should threaten to continue their trampling upon your rights as a congregation, then call to your assistance the proper civil authorities and with their help assert and maintain your rights.
>
> As matters now stand, no Catholic can be deceived as to the line of conduct it is his duty to follow; no member of your parish can stand on neutral

[41] Bishop McQuaid's Sermon in St. Mary's Church, February 28, 1869, *Rochester Union and Advertiser*, March 2, 1869.

ground; he is for the Bishop and established discipline, or against the Bishop and for the law which the Rev. Thomas O'Flaherty has sought to establish. The stale story of O'Flaherty's permanent appointment by the Pope as Pastor and Dean may have deceived some for a time; no one is now deceived by it but those who are willing to be deceived. The story originated in the same prolific brain which gave birth to the other foundling that the Rev. Mr. Kavanagh had been removed from Auburn on a previous occasion by command of Cardinal Barnabo.

After an appeal to the American Protestant public, to mob law, to the Supreme Court, it will be waste of time and money to carry an appeal to Rome. Nor is it at all likely that the "intelligent and influential" mob that hooted a Bishop through the streets, that with fury of madmen hindered the celebration of Mass on the following morning, will be able to demonstrate to Rome the many excellencies and Christian virtues, the sound Catholic teaching and the usefulness of the labors of their late Pastor.[42]

Contrary to Bishop McQuaid's expectations, O'Flaherty carried his case to Rome, inasmuch as the Archbishop of New York failed to act on the strength of an appeal taken to the Metropolitan Court, March 25, 1869,[43] by the suspended priest, who persistently ignored the Diocesan Court established in the Diocesan Council. The Bishop's presence in Rome at the time, in attendance upon the Vatican Council, made it possible for him to take charge of the matter personally. "A few words of explanation at the Propaganda soon satisfied them with regard to O'Flaherty's character and acts. Still I hold it to be wrong for the Propaganda to entertain appeals when a priest refuses to have his case examined by the regularly appointed tribunal." Bishop McQuaid consoled himself with the thought that the Vatican Council would "in all probability regulate some of these matters. Instead of breaking down discipline, there is more likelihood of there being a straightening up in some points. Some who are clamorous for the rights of priests may find that there are rights also for bishops and people."[44]

The Vatican Council never reached matters of this kind, as its energies in the short period of its activity were largely concerned with the great question of papal infallibility. The opportuneness of the definition of this dogma did not appeal to Bishop McQuaid, who consistently joined the opposition on every possible occasion. "I am afraid," he wrote Dr. Corrigan,

---

[42] *Rochester Union and Advertiser*, April 13; from the *Auburn Morning News*, April 10, 1869.

[43] Metropolitan, New York. New York Archdiocesan Archives, Archbishop's House.

[44] Bishop McQuaid to Dr. Corrigan, Rome, February 6, 1870: Bishops to M. A. C., 1865–1883. New York Archdiocesan Archives, Dunwoodie Seminary.

then of Seton Hall, "that there is a determination to pass abstract questions as decrees that may be true enough in themselves, but which will be highly injurious to us in America from the handle they will give our enemies. If I had not confidence in God's protecting hand, I would run from the Council in despair, so strangely ignorant are many men of what is going on in the world. We need the earnest prayers of all earnest Catholics."[45] Not only the decrees themselves, but also the methods pursued in the Council were objectionable in some respects to Bishop McQuaid and others. As early as December 12, 1869, twenty prelates, amongst whom were two Americans, Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis and Bishop McQuaid of Rochster, presented a petition to the Holy Father, suggesting certain emendations in the published order of the Council to bring out more plainly the fulness of examination and the most perfect liberty of discussion within the Council.[46] These prelates also demanded, as modern times seemed to require, greater publicity despite the oath of secrecy exacted of the members of the Council. They received practically no satisfaction at the time,[47] but changes were later made in the published order of the Council,[48] and Cardinal Manning was released from the oath of secrecy that he might keep the British Cabinet informed through Odo Russell of the real state of affairs, so often misrepresented in the campaign of vilification then waged against the Council, while, also, a Bishop of the Italian, French, and German tongues was likewise freed from the oath of secrecy.[49]

At the beginning of 1870, when the petition for the definition of papal infallibility was being circulated, Bishop McQuaid's name appeared amongst the one hundred and thirty-six prelates of the opposition, in the petition of the twenty-seven bishops from English-speaking countries, twenty of whom were Americans, who asked the Holy Father not to submit the question of papal infallibility to the Council for definition.[50] The great majority

[45] *Ibid.*

[46] *Acta et Decreta Conciliorum. Collectio Lacensis*, Vol. vii, col. 915 *sqq.*

[47] *Ibid.*, Col. 917.

[48] February 20, 1870. *Ibid.*, Col. 67–69.

[49] CARDINAL MANNING, *Reminiscences of the Vatican Council*, 1887, in PURCELL, *Life of Cardinal Manning*, Vol. ii, p. 454; cf. note, September 18, 1887; *ibid.*, p. 455.

[50] *Acta et Decreta Conciliorum, Collectio Lacensis*, Vol. vii, Col. 947.

of the prelates demanded the definition, and so the matter was submitted to the consideration of the Council, which finally, June 3, 1870, decided to close the general discussion "*De Romano Pontifice.*"[51] The very next day eighty-one prelates, amongst whom there were eight Americans and one of these, Bishop McQuaid, protested against this procedure,[52] but the protest was not admitted,[53] as the discussion had been ample almost beyond endurance and there was still room for five individual discussions, namely, on the proemium and the four chapters following. In the course of the fifth discussion a division was taken by mutual consent on July 13, when 451 voted the definition of papal infallibility, 88 voted against it, and 62 gave a conditional vote.[54] Bishop McQuaid was amongst the 88 who voted against the definition.[55]

A deputation of these prelates, who were not willing to define infallibility as proposed, waited upon the Holy Father in the evening of July 15 with a statement that they would vote in favor of infallibility, provided some changes were made in the Constitution on the Church of Christ.[56] Pius IX ordered Archbishop Darboy of Paris to reduce to writing what they desired. Chapter III, *On the Power and Nature of the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff*, teaches and declares "that, by the appointment of our Lord, the Roman Church possesses a sovereignty of ordinary power over all other churches, and that this power of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, which is truly episcopal, is immediate; etc., etc." The opposition requested the suppression of the phrase that makes the power of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff over all other churches "truly episcopal." The Canon concluding this chapter pronounces an anathema upon any "who assert that he possesses merely the principal part, and not all the fulness of this supreme power." The opposition also wished this phrase expunged. Finally Chapter IV, *Concerning the Infallible Teaching of the Roman Pontiff*, defines "that it is a dogma divinely revealed: that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*,

[51] *Ibid.*, col. 748, Col. 984 *sqq.*
[52] *Ibid.*, col. 986 *sqq.*
[53] *Ibid.*, col. 988.
[54] *Ibid.*, col. 760.
[55] *Ibid.*, col. 1003.
[56] *Ibid.*, col. 1702.

that is, when, in discharge of the office of pastor and teacher of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding the faith or morals to be held by the Universal Church, is, by the divine assistance promised to him in Blessed Peter, possessed of that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed that his Church should be endowed in defining doctrine regarding faith or morals; etc., etc." Here the opposition wished an addition to be made so as to qualify the manner in which the Pope is to exercise his office as teacher of all Christians, namely, "resting on the testimonies of the Churches," or "by the use of means that had always been employed in the Catholic Church," or "Bishops not excluded." The evident purpose of all this was not to sacrifice episcopal prerogative to papal prerogative. Archbishop Darboy declared that nearly all the Fathers who had voted against papal infallibility in the General Congregation would vote *placet* in the Public Session if the desired changes were made.[57] Pius IX had the undersecretary of the Council refuse any such concessions as were requested, committing all to a General Congregation, but with definitive judgment reserved to himself. These Fathers then held meetings, July 16 and 17, and decided by a vote of thirty-six against twenty-eight to absent themselves from the Public Session, which was fixed for July 18, when the papal prerogatives of a universal primacy and of infallibility were to be publicly attested by a vote of *placet* or *non placet*.[58] Bishop McQuaid was not present at this session,[59] although he did not leave Rome until the evening of that day.[60] He had obtained permission from the Council, July 16, to leave without the obligation to return, "on account of several needs of his diocese most recently erected."[61] Bishop McQuaid made his way home as quickly as possible, and on August 28, 1870, gave the people in his Cathedral a good account of the definition of papal infallibility at the Council of the Vatican.

> The question is simple enough. The definition is clear enough. It answers objections as well as states the doctrine. . . . I have now no difficulty in accepting the dogma, although to the last I opposed it, because,

[57] *Ibid.*, col. 992.

[58] *Ibid.*, col. 1702 *sq.*

[59] *Ibid.*, col. 1003.

[60] Bishop Bayley to Dr. Corrigan, July 28, 1870; Bishops to M. A. C., 1865–1883. New York Archdiocesan Archives, Dunwoodie Seminary.

[61] *Acta et Decreta Conciliorum, Collectio Lacensis*, Vol. vii, col. 762*b*.

somehow or other, it was in my head that the bishops ought to be consulted, and I know, my friends, that all you want is the truth of God's Church, and when the question so long unsettled was settled, it was a relief and a pleasure to the minds of many.[62]

Bishop McQuaid had advanced a real and not a fictitious excuse to be freed permanently of the obligation of further attendance at the Vatican Council. He was thoroughly conscious of "the needs of his diocese most recently erected," for he wrote late in life in a reminiscent mood: "When a Bishop's responsibility came to me, it did not take me long to see that my first duty was to take care of the children of the people, and as essential thereto the establishment of a teaching Sisterhood. . . . My second duty was to build up a seminary that was to give a priestly priesthood to the Church."[63] The O'Flaherty case and the Vatican Council had not permitted Bishop McQuaid to begin the realization of this ambitious program of work. Upon his return home he established all that he could at the time for ecclesiastical education, the Preparatory Seminary back of the Cathedral House. He also vigorously set to work upon building up a parochial school system of education that was to reach every Catholic child in districts of sufficient Catholic population to support a good parochial school. This meant the renewal of the school question, the agitation of which had ceased for quite a time, so that the resurrection of a seemingly dead issue was anything but welcome to certain circles even within the Catholic Church. "You may remember," he later wrote Bishop Gilmour of Cleveland, "how pacific and non-offensive ecclesiastics spoke of me when I raked the ashes off the smouldering school question and flamed the embers into a blaze. My own Archbishop was full of wise caution and Archbishop Bayley was afraid I was going too far. I send you by this mail a marked copy of one of our papers. The writer of the article, who is the editor himself, thinks that I was only a little in advance of my time."[64] A storm cleared the atmosphere for better action not only abroad but also at home. On December 19, 1870, Bishop McQuaid wrote Dr. Corrigan, who had come from Seton Hall College to assist at the solemn blessing

[62] *Rochester Union and Advertiser*, August 29, 1870.

[63] Bishop McQuaid to Mother Xavier, February 20, 1907, St. Elizabeth College Letters.

[64] February 25, 1887 No. 4, No. A, Bishops from 1872–1888, Cleveland Diocesan Archives.

of the Cathedral by Archbishop McCloskey, and meanwhile returned home:

> I have had a rather lively time here since your visit, with not a little to annoy me. I requested the removal of the Sisters of Charity from the Asylum and Parochial School. The Brothers undertook to resent the action of the Bishop, and broke up their school, saying to the children that they would not wait to be kicked by the Bishop as the Sisters had been. Their acts and the talk of the departing Sisters, together with the ignorance of the laity and the malice of many, made quite a sensation for a couple of weeks.
>
> I would go through twice as much to bring about the change which has been effected. I shall now be able to have good parochial schools in this parish and in the city.
>
> A school-house will be built in this parish, another in the Immaculate Conception, and a third in St. Bridget's this coming year. Thus, little by little, the disgrace which now hangs over us will be removed.
>
> The Sisters of St. Joseph who are to be the Diocesan school teachers are doing very well, and promise great success in their work.[65]

The erection of new school buildings and the formation of a Diocesan Teaching Sisterhood constituted only a part of the work planned. Bishop McQuaid also boldly attacked the Public School System's monopoly of support out of public taxes in two great lectures on *Free Christian Schools* which he delivered to overcrowded audiences in the Corinthian Hall, Rochester, December 8, 1870, and March 15, 1872. He championed the rights of parents whose conscience would not allow them to send their children to schools where there was no Catholic instruction, no Catholic atmosphere, and much less to schools that were either Protestant or infidel, such as were the public schools of the time. He cited copiously from Protestant ministers and educators who argued strongly for support of their denominational academies, to which their richer co-religionists sent their children to be trained in the religion of their parents as well as in secular learning. Bishop McQuaid, however, was working for the rank and file of his Catholic people, and it was in fairness to them that he asked for an extension of the Public School System so as to embrace also the parochial school.[66]

> My proposition would still have a system of State schools. It does not purpose to disintegrate, but to extend. It would bring the State back to the starting point of an elementary education, and on that basis takes a "new

[65] Bishops to M. A. C., 1865–1883. New York Archdiocesan Archives, Dunwoodie Seminary.

[66] Two speeches published at once separately in English and German, and together in 1892 plus (1) *The Public School Question as Understood by a Catholic Citizen* before the Free Religious Association, February 13, 1876; (2) *Religion in Schools, North American Review*, April, 1881; (3) *Religious Teaching in Schools, Forum*, December, 1889.

> departure." Instead of the State having under its supervision only twenty schools, as here in Rochester, it would have a hundred and more; instead of having a limited number of teachers dependent on school commissioners and politicians only, there would be a much larger number dependent on the State for certificates for capacity and for results, and on the parents of the children for general success. Under the system proposed by me the State would have the right to decide on the fitness of the school building, furniture, etc., examine into the qualifications of teachers to impart a knowledge of the branches it pays for, fix the number of hours devoted to the study of these branches, inspect and examine the classes from time to time, and make such regulations as may be necessary to guard against abuses, misapplication of monies, etc. All schools receiving aid from the State should be under state supervision, leaving parents the liberty to regulate the management of the schools to which they elect to send their children after having complied with the requirements of the State.[67]

While this earnest plea for an equitable share of the taxes paid to the State by Catholics as well as by Protestants and others bore no fruit, Bishop McQuaid soon gave practical proof that it was possible for the State to control secular education without any interference with the religious activity of the parochial school. He had occasion later to explain to Cardinal Ledochowski how this was done through the Regents of the University of the State of New York.

> Unless I am mistaken, the State of New York is the only one of the United States which has such a board of Regents in charge of their educational system. They have under their care the colleges, academies, and schools of the State. They in no way interfere in the religious working of our Catholic institutions of learning; only if these wish to put themselves under the University they can do so, and complying with certain conditions can obtain a certificate, a diploma, or a degree in secular studies, the same as the non-Catholic institutions of learning in the State. In the year 1874, the parochial school of the Cathedral of Rochester was the first to take advantage of the Regents' examination and win for its pupils the State's certificate. Now, all over the State, Catholic schools and academies, in secular studies, equal and even surpass the non-Catholic institutions of the same grade. By voluntarily accepting this supervision of the State, which we can do without the sacrifice of any principle, there has been a marvellous improvement in teacher and pupils. There is no place for partiality or favoritism; the questions and matter for examination are prepared at the governmental offices in Albany where the Regents have their bureau of administration, and are sent to all schools and academies that apply for them, Catholic and non-Catholic alike. We receive no money or support from the State as the State schools receive, but it is our ambition to show to our people and to others that our schools are as good and better than the State schools, even by their own tests.[68]

Bishop McQuaid could feel well satisfied with the results. Nevertheless, precisely at the time parochial school education was thus advantageously put under State control, he was vexed to find much lukewarmness even among the Catholic clergy for

---

[67] Bishop McQuaid to the Editor of the *Democrat and Chronicle*, March 22, 1872; *Union and Advertiser*, March 26, 1872.

[68] Bishop McQuaid to Cardinal Ledochowski, c., February, 1895. Original draft in my possession.

the cause of Catholic education. An impending decision on the matter by Rome was welcome news to him, as he wrote Archbishop Bayley, June 29. 1874:

> I am glad that the moral duties of priests and parents with regard to Christian education of children are to be defined with some precision so that we may know exactly what course to follow. It is not pleasant to be put in the power of the hosts of young fledglings coming over from Rome bursting with conceit, or to be snubbed by laymen.
>
> What you tell me about the practice in Rome surprises me exceedingly. Rome is always sound in theory but dreadfully loose in practice, once the difficulties of the theories come home to herself. If it be true that in Rome, where Catholic schools abound, Catholic parents can send their children to State schools such as they now have, I don't see how I can be justified in the course which I now follow. So soon as a parish is provided with ample schoolroom, good teachers, and free of costs, I refuse absolution to all parents who send their children to the public schools. Without approving of the High School, I do not refuse absolution to those who send there, as we have no school of corresponding grade.
>
> The whole question will have to be settled on a well-defined basis up to which we shall have to live. I do not wish to be regarded as an extremist in my views, but, if I am right, some others are wrong. The expediency of agitating for our rights is another question. It would be better for us to be of one mind and work together. I do not see any prospect of bringing about unity of action, and I keep the discussion agoing in my own way wherever and whenever I can.[69]

Bishop McQuaid's vigorous Catholic school policy was practically maintained in the *Instruction on Public Schools* issued by the Congregation of the Holy Office for the Bishops of the United States, November 24, 1875. Its concluding sentence made it expressly "manifest from Catholic moral teaching that parents, who neglect to impart to their children this necessary Christian education and training, or who allow them to frequent such schools in which the ruin of souls is inevitable, or finally who, when there is a suitable school in the place, fittingly furnished and equipped, or when they have the means of giving a Catholic education to their offspring elsewhere, nevertheless send their children to public schools, without sufficient reason, and without the necessary precautions, by which the proximate danger of perversion is made remote, cannot be absolved in the Sacrament of Penance."[70] This was more than enough for Bishop McQuaid, and he took occasion to emphasize the point in the pastoral which he published, October 4, 1878, on the eve of his departure for his visit *ad limina* in Rome.

> No Catholic is in harmony with the Church who maintains opinions opposed to those teachings. It is absurd to say that one bishop more than

[69] Letters to Archbishop Bayley, No. 42, L to Z, Baltimore Cathedral Archives.

[70] *Collectanea S. Congregat. de Propag. Fide*, No. 481, pp. 204-5. Also *Acta Sanctae Sedis*, Vol. xi (1878), pp. 44–48.

another insists on the establishment of Catholic schools. It is not left with bishops to choose in this matter. They receive commands from an authority higher than their own, and know that their duty, based on their faith and conscience, obliges them to urge the maintaining of Catholic schools wherever it is possible. The false idea that one diocese has a law on the subject different from another needs correction. The bishop who fails to teach and enforce with pastoral zeal and vigilance the Church's law of Catholic schools for Catholic children, sins; the pastor of a flock who, being able, neglects to provide such a school for the young ones, the weak, the helpless, the greatly exposed, sins; the members of a parish who refuse to cooperate according to their means in the establishment of a Catholic School for their children, sin.

. . . . . .

In the districts in which it is not possible to have a Catholic school, Catholic parents who have to make use of the common or public school, are obliged in conscience to make sure, by watchful examination and enquiry, that nothing is permitted in these schools contrary to Catholic faith and morals. To some extent they are protected in this right by the law of the State of New York, which forbids religious exercises of any kind during school hours. As any exercises that might be carried on by an over-zealous school teacher would necessarily be non-Catholic in character, Catholic parents are bound to guard their children from the efforts of these would-be proselytizers. Should the teachers and trustees be deaf to mild remonstrances, recourse must be had to the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of New York, whose duty it is to rebuke these bigots and breakers of the law.[71]

Bishop McQuaid's visit to Rome took place at a most critical moment in the development of the Catholic Church in America. Everlasting appeals to Rome seriously threatened episcopal government within the dioceses by undermining episcopal authority, and Rome was almost duped into legislating in favor of the Malcontents when Bishop McQuaid intervened "and then and there, by bold officiousness, staved off a great calamity of the American Church."[72] He kept Bishop Corrigan well informed of the matter at the time, who wrote the Archbishop of Baltimore, February 1, 1879:

The Bishop of Rochester has been fighting our battle bravely before the S. Congregation. At Cardinal Simeoni's request, he has written one or two memorials (the third being his own). The most important came to hand last night and is now in the hands of my Metropolitan.

The chief issue is this, "*Must* a Prelate consult the Commission before making *any* transfer of a pastor from church to church, against the will of the latter?

In Rome they had already decided *in the affirmative*, but postponed sending the answer. Meanwhile Bishop McQuaid was shown the letter all ready to be mailed, and begged a reconsideration of the question, or at least that the bishops here be written to before a final decision be made.

They asked him to remain in Rome until February 1, promising to have his Memorial printed, distributed to the Cardinals, and acted upon by that date. He sails from Liverpool, February 22.[73]

---

[71] Printed in pamphlet form by *Waterloo Catholic Times Press*.

[72] Bishop McQuaid to Bishop Gilmour, April 12, 1885, Cleveland Diocesan Archives, No. 4, No. A, *Bishops from 1872 to 1888*.

[73] No. 46 C, Baltimore Cathedral Archives.

Bishop McQuaid's worst fears were excited; he was afraid that the new legislation "would inflict very great injury on the Church in this country."[74] He did not spare himself to avert the disaster, and fortunately was able to intervene sufficiently before sickness disabled him from taking further part in the conflict. The anxiety which his letters aroused in Bishop Corrigan was finally relieved by another letter written by Bishop McQuaid to him from Paris, March 29, 1879:

> My strength is coming back gradually, and I have reason to hope that by the time I reach America I shall be myself again. I had a narrow escape.
>
> However, I was compensated for all my sufferings by the success of the great question before the Sacred Congregation.
>
> Until I got Cardinal Manning and the English bishops aroused, all seemed lost. Only two or three Cardinals of a dozen appeared inclined to take my view of the subject. Bilio was dead against us, and he is a power in the Congregation. My whole cry was for delay until the American bishops could be heard from. On my knees I begged the Holy Father not to permit this question to be settled without consulting the bishops of the U. S.
>
> He enquired about the matter when I took leave of him, and showed great satisfaction when told that all was according to our wish.
>
> I left Rome on the 11th of March. The day before the Congregation met and appointed Card. Simeoni and two others to draw up the letter of explanation of the "Instructio."[75]

On his arrival at home, Bishop McQuaid soon recovered his full strength. He awaited the text of the important document with considerable impatience; when it did arrive, it gave him all the satisfaction he had desired. "The *Instructio* as explained," he wrote Bishop Corrigan, December 2, 1879, "is not the great thing that some disaffected priests looked for. Fixity of tenure and immunity of discipline were what they wanted. Bishops and people were to have no rights as against their claims."[76] The Roman document made it perfectly plain that the *Instructio* of July 20, 1878, in regard to cases in which an ecclesiastical penalty or censure was to be inflicted or a grave disciplinary correction was to obtain, in no way altered or annulled the decrees of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, No. 125 on the Nature of Missions, and Nos. 77 and 108 on the Juridical Effects of the Removal of Missionaries from Office. Bishops, however, were instructed not to remove priests from one mission to another against their will without a grave and reasonable cause. In case

---

[74] Bishop Corrigan to ——, January 4, 1879. *Ibid.*

[75] Bishops to M. A. C., 1865–1883. New York Archdiocesan Archives, Dunwoodie Seminary.

[76] *Ibid.*

of a definitive removal of a rector from office because of a penalty to be inflicted for an offence, the Bishop was only to act after hearing his Council. Though its vote was only consultive, the opinion of the Council was always to be inserted in the process together with the minutes of the investigation. Nevertheless, bishops were not deprived of the power to proceed to suspension *ex informata conscientia*, provided they judged in the Lord that most grave and canonical causes concurred, or that a remedy had to be procured without hearing the Council because of grave and urgent necessity for the salvation of souls. Finally, each rector was free to bring with him before the Council another priest to witness the proceedings or to assist in his defence, but this priest had to be approved by the Bishop.[77]

Neither the *Instructio* nor the *Responsa ad dubia* gave the bishops of the United States immunity from harassing appeals to Rome when they encountered trouble in their efforts to discipline recalcitrant members of their clergy. This condition of affairs, besides other things, made new conciliar legislation advisable in this country, and on February 27, 1883, Bishop McQuaid informed Bishop Gilmour of the preparatory work that he was doing for prospective legislation by a provincial council of New York: "I am now writing a long letter to Cardinal Simeoni asking for information on certain points connected with the *Instructio* and the *Responsa ad dubia*. I tell him that I do so as a member of the commission *de disciplina* preparing the matter for the Council; that I wish to clear up all difficulties for the correct and smooth working of the *Instructio*. His answers, if I can get them, will settle many things to our great comfort."[78] The Fourth Provincial Council of New York had been called for June 3,[79] but the bad health of the Cardinal, Archbishop McCloskey, made necessary its postponement till the following September.[80] The first solemn session was held Sunday, September 23. After the Solemn Mass in the presence of the Cardinal, Bishop McQuaid preached to the people on provincial councils.[81] Even

[77] *Acta Sanctae Sedis.*

[78] Cleveland Diocesan Archives, No. 4, No. A, *Bishops from 1872 to 1888.*

[79] Cf. Litterae Indictionis Concilii in Acta et Decreta Concil. Provin. IV Neo-Eboracensis, p. xv *sq.*

[80] *Ibid.*, p. xvii.

[81] *Ibid.*, p. xxx *sq.*

before the Council the legislation submitted to its discussion had received careful attention and criticism from bishops and theologians,[82] and so the final work of the Council could be pushed on without being hampered by hardly any delay. The pastoral letter addressed to the laity by the united Episcopate of the Province, mainly the work of Bishop O'Farrell of Trenton,[83] insisted just as vigorously as Bishop McQuaid's Pastoral of 1878 on the uncompromising hostility of the Church to secret oath-bound societies and to "any system of public instruction from which religion is totally excluded."[84] These matters, as well as others affecting the laity, received full attention in the decrees of the Council, in the formulation of which no diversity of opinion was apparent. The same spirit of unanimity is also evident in the making of the decrees dealing with the life of the clergy, except in regard to one particular, the fifteenth Chapter, *De Vita Clericorum*,[85] which was amongst the matter apportioned to the congregation *De Personis Ecclesiasticis* under the presidency of Bishop McQuaid.[86] The chapter specified in great detail the *causa gravis et rationabilis* necessary for the removal of a rector from one mission to another even against the rector's will. The Cardinal in the fourth private congregation of the bishops, September 26, proposed the omission of this matter from the decrees of the Council, as it was to enter into the deliberations of the Metropolitans summoned to Rome for November to prepare for a National Council. The Bishop of Buffalo, however, thought it worth while to retain this matter, as thus would appear what was desired in this region. The Cardinal then consented to have the matter remain as it had been formulated on condition that a note be added to the effect that the article had been drawn up before the archbishops were summoned to Rome. This pleased all the bishops in the Provincial Council of New York.[87] The Third Plenary Council of Baltimore almost totally eclipsed this Fourth Provincial Council of New York, the proceed-

[82] *Ibid.*, p. xxx: viii Coetus Praeparatorius Episcoporum et Theologorum.

[83] *Ibid.*, p. xxiv: vi Coetus Praeparatorius Epp.; p. xxxiv: x congregatio, privata epp. prima.

[84] *Ibid.*, pp. xlvii–lxviii.

[85] *Ibid.*, p. 74 *sq.*

[86] *Ibid.*, p. xxviii.

[87] *Ibid.*, p. xxxvi; *cf.* note, p. 74.

ings of which seem to have been pigeon-holed by the Propaganda. As late as January 18, 1886, Bishop McQuaid informed Archbishop Corrigan that he had written "a pretty sharp letter" to a friend resident in Rome "in relation to the ignoring of the Provincial Council of New York, giving permission to communicate its contents where they may do good."[88] Its Acts and Decrees were finally acted upon by the Congregation of the Propaganda, July 8, 1886, and approved by Pope Leo XIII three days later.[89]

The Third Plenary Council of Baltimore opened in the Cathedral of Baltimore, Sunday, November 9, and closed a month later, December 7, 1884. Its legislation is grouped together under eleven titles. Beginning with Faith, they deal with the Persons of the Church, Divine Worship, the Sacraments, the Training of the Clergy, the Education of the Catholic Youth, Christian Doctrine, Zeal for Souls, Church Property, Ecclesiastical Courts, and Ecclesiastical Burial. The Schema of legislation prepared under these heads by the Roman authorities with the help of the American archbishops was divided up and distributed among twelve deputations of theologians to pass through a committee stage before coming up for final action in the Plenary Council itself. Bishop McQuaid belonged to the Fourth Deputation under the presidency of Archbishop Corrigan, which had assigned to it the legislation on Regulars, the Faculty of Binating Mass, Uniformity in Feasts and Fasts, the Observance of Sunday, Sacred Music, and the Baptism of Converts. This covered all the matter of the Title on Divine Worship, the last chapter of the Title on the Persons of the Church, and the first chapter of the Title on the Sacraments.[90] The most important part of the legislation submitted to this Fourth Deputation was the chapter on Regulars. Bishop McQuaid had followed with keen interest the conflict between the English Hierarchy and the Regulars, which ended in the settlement of their mutual relations in the matter of church property by the Holy See in the Constitution "Romanos Pontifices," issued May 8, 1881.[91] An

[88] *Bishops and Dignitaries*, 1886–1887, to M. A. C. New York Archdiocesan Archives, Dunwoodie Seminary.

[89] Cf. Decretum Recognitionis Concilii Provincialis Neo Eboracensis IV, July 15, 1886, in *Acta et Decreta*, etc., p. xi.

[90] *Acta et Decreta Concil. Plen. Balt. III*, p. xxvi *sqq.*

[91] *Ibid.*, p. 212 *sqq.*

extension of the provisions of this constitution to the Church of the United States was earnestly desired there, and the Holy See had already signified its readiness freely to grant a petition to that effect.[92] Consequently the legislation of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore on Regulars was based primarily on this Constitution.[93] Thus the bishops of the United States profited of the labors of the English Hierarchy for a satisfactory settlement of a pressing question in various portions of this country.

The Plenary Sessions of the Council gave Bishop McQuaid the occasion to make his voice and vote tell in the settlement of many other points of legislation. Repeated visitations of his own diocese had made Bishop McQuaid familiar with them so that he could take part in the debate on the ceremonial to be followed in this work with advantages not possessed by many others.[94] When the right of suffrage for filling a vacancy in an episcopal see was considered in the Council, Bishop McQuaid was in favor of giving a vote in this matter also to the Chancellor, the Deans, the Rector of the Cathedral, and the Superiors of Seminaries,[95] but the approved decrees limited the proposition of three names for the vacant bishopric to the consultors and the irremovable rectors.[96] Both these classes of clerics occasioned considerable discussion in the Council. Though the Schema had *consensus* in some things, the bishops were unwilling to be dependant on the Diocesan Consultors for anything more than counsel, and Bishop McQuaid thought that their counsel was always to be given by them as a body.[97] When great reluctance was shown by the Council to the creation of irremovable rectors, the Bishop of Rochester gave testimony that he had advised the institution of such rectors in place of chapters when he was last in Rome.[98] The approved decrees made imperative the

---

[92] *Ibid.*, p. 47; *cf.* Decretum Extensionis, p. cv.

[93] *Ibid.*, pp. 47–49.

[94] [Private] *Acta et Decreta Concilii Plen. Balt. Tertii*, p. xxix ad num. 18: Congregatio Prima Privata, Feria II, Die 10 November.

[95] *Ibid.*, p. lii: Congregat. 13 Privata, Feria II, Die 24 November.

[96] [Public] *Acta et Decreta*, p. 12, No. 15.

[97] [Private] *Acta et Decreta.* Congregat. 4 Privata, Feria VI, Die 14 November ad. num. 23.

[98] *Ibid.*, Congregat. 8, Feria IV, Die 18 November, pp. xl–xliii.

creation of irremovable rectors within three years.[99] In this matter the bishops seemed especially fearful of the results as far as discipline was concerned. Malcontents had made every effort to claim irremovability even before the creation of irremovable rectors, and Bishop McQuaid in 1878-79, saved the day for the authority of bishops by obtaining a reconsideration of the *Instructio* of July 20, 1878, in the *Responsa ad Dubia*. However, in 1884 these documents were superseded by another Instruction of the Propaganda, *Cum Magnopere*, which formed the basis of the new conciliar legislation submitted to the deliberation of the assembled prelates. A determined effort was made to escape the necessity of episcopal courts for the trial of clerics along the lines prescribed. Some held that the matter had been definitively settled by the Propaganda, but Bishop McQuaid, not without support from others, said that it was their right and duty to point out the difficulties under which the new method labored, which he thought would hardly bring the guilty to punishment.[100] Finally, the Archbishops of St. Louis, of Boston, and of Petra, the Bishops of Richmond, Rochester, and Trenton, and the Vicar-Apostolic of Dakota were appointed humbly to petition the Holy Father to have the old form of trials in clerical cases retained.[101] Bishop McQuaid also took exception to the inquisitional methods recommended in the Schema for the extra-judicial procedure in the criminal cases of clerics; he recommended the substitution of other words designating an honest and legitimate investigation. The Archbishop of Boston also thought that some of the passage ought to be suppressed; he suggested that this part of the minutes of the Council should not be sent to Rome unless the petition of the Council for the retention of the old form of ecclesiastical trials was rejected by the Holy See. All voted the suggestion thus made, and for this reason a loose sheet was printed of this part of the minutes of the Council to be inserted or omitted from the copy to be presented to Rome according to circumstances.[102] However, the authorities there insisted on the erection of the

[99] [Public] *Acta et Decreta*, p. 22, No. 35.

[100] [Private] *Acta et Decreta*. Congregat. 26 Private, Feria V, 4 December, p. lxxxvi *sq*.

[101] *Ibid*., p. xci.

[102] *Ibid*., Quaedam ex Actis quae una cum Schemate Novo typis impresso vulgata non fuerunt. *Cf*. [Public] *Acta et Decreta*, p. 176.

prescribed Episcopal Courts within three years after the promulgation of the Council, unless a further dispensation was obtained from the Propaganda. In this case the trial of clerics was to follow the procedure in the *Instructio* of July 20, 1878, and its interpretation in the *Responsa ad dubia*.[103]

The sad necessity of such legislation emphasized all the more the need of giving the best possible training to candidates for the Holy Priesthood in the Preparatory as well as in the Higher Seminary. The Schema even prescribed the establishment of villas to take care of the ecclesiastical students in the higher seminaries during the vacation. Bishop McQuaid took an active part in the discussion which led to a considerable modification of this part of the Schema. He did not believe in villas as the only means to preserve students, both before and after the reception of orders, immune from the danger of sin. Vacation was a time to test students to see what kind of priests they are going to make. This country's conditions were not those of Italy; our priests are thrown at once into the midst of dangers as soon as ordained, and they must have given proof before that they know how to conduct themselves in the world.[104] Despite his interest in ecclesiastical education and training, Bishop McQuaid begged to be excused from serving as a member of the Committee on Seminaries;[105] he vigorously criticized, however, the failure of the Schema to put more emphasis on the study of English;[106] he failed finally to reorganize his own Preparatory Seminary in accordance with the new legislation, as he thought "the Plenary Council enjoined a course of studies and demanded an excellence of attainment simply impossible in nine cases out of ten."[107] Nevertheless, Bishop McQuaid later wrote in terms of highest commendation of this part of the work done by the Council.

> The Third Plenary Council of Baltimore has decreed largely and in detail what courses of study are to be followed in these two Seminaries, the preparatory and the higher. These courses cover the ground well. The Council

[103] [Public] *Acta et Decreta*, p. 170 *sq*, Nos. 297 and 298.

[104] [Private] *Acta et Decreta*. Congregat. 16 Privata, Feria IV, 26 November, p. lix.

[105] *Ibid.*, November 24, p. liii.

[106] [Private] *Acta et Decreta*. Congregat. 15 Privata, Feria III, die 25 November, p. lvi.

[107] Bishop McQuaid to Rev. ——. Inclosed in letter to Bishop Gilmour, February 20, 1887. Cleveland Diocesan Archives, No. 4, No. A, *Bishops from 1872 to 1888*.

> decrees that not less than six years shall be spent in following them. Perhaps the Council was in advance of its day in prescribing six full years; then it could not have meant seriously that the course of study it mapped out should be completed in less time. The chapter on our higher Seminaries is overflowing with wise prescriptions for conduct and studies. Its courses of studies are much the same as are followed in the Propaganda and the best schools in Rome; they are the same as the studies insisted on in all the higher seminaries lately sanctioned by the Sacred Congregation of Studies in Padua, in Spain, Mexico, and Maynooth, with the annexed condition of conferring academic degrees on their successful students. There is no reason to suppose that the same privilege will be withheld from other well-organized Seminaries asking for it.[108]

In fact one of the reasons of Bishop McQuaid's opposition to the Catholic University at Washington was the endeavor of its first promoters to make the faculty of giving degrees a monopoly of that institution. He felt that "this is too big a country, with a marvellous growth year by year, to be restricted by such fetters as it was proposed to put on the Church in these U. S."[109] Moreover, Bishop McQuaid then thought the Diocesan Seminary the question of the hour in ecclesiastical education in America.

> It is at this time that some are calling aloud for the establishment of a grand Catholic University, and of a Theological Seminary for extended and higher studies. An essential condition preparatory to the founding of such a university is to know that there are young men willing and ready to take advantage of its facilities of a university course of study. A second condition lies in the getting together of a large sum of money sufficient to place the University on a solid financial basis. A University, in a rich country like America, cannot go abegging among the poor and rich; Catholics show no inclination to rival non-Catholics by endowing educational institutions. We must wait and pray for a change in both respects before the dream of a Catholic University, except in name, can be realized.
>
> The founding of a Theological School for higher studies is more feasible and is nearer at hand than that of the University. It may lead the way to the University. But antecedent to the founding of this Theological University will be the establishing of Diocesan Seminaries to answer the ordinary and usual wants of a diocese and to serve as feeders to the higher school. This is the primary necessity, and is according to the mind of the Church and the instructions of Rome.

This was written in the Pastoral on the Seminary Collection, August 20, 1882, and it is remarkable how closely the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore assembled two years later parallels these suggestions of Bishop McQuaid in the chapter of its decrees *De Seminario Principali*, from which, as from a seed, the University was to grow.[110] When the promoters of the University went beyond the decrees of the Council, opposition naturally arose, and even increased in strength, as policies were espoused

---

[108] Bishop McQuaid, *Our American Seminaries*, in the *Am. Eccl. Rev.*, May, 1887, p. 467 *sq.*

[109] Bishop McQuaid to ——, December 28, 1887. Baltimore Cathedral Archives.

[110] [Private] *Acta et Decreta*, p. lxxix; [Public] *Acta et Decreta*, p. 93.

by University men hostile to Bishop McQuaid's thought and life. Unfortunately, for instance, the Parochial School System vigorously championed at the Catholic University of Washington today was not always a cause so strongly espoused there. Despite this and actual financial ruin so often prophesied by Bishop McQuaid, every Catholic today would be pleased to see the University develop into a great institution of learning, productive of scholarly dissertations and reviews of the rank and grade attained by the great Catholic universities of Europe.

The Third Plenary Council of Baltimore was itself emphatic enough on the Catholic school question. Obligatory attendance, however, at the parochial school also raised some discussion there. Bishop McQuaid denied the existence of any obligation of the kind, if there were no suitable Catholic school. However, if there were such a school, parents transgressing the law might rightly be refused the Sacraments.[111] The final decrees of the Council not only urged, but commanded parents to send their children to the parochial school unless the Ordinary allowed otherwise in a particular case.[112] There was, nevertheless, no intention to claim a monopoly of Catholic education for the parochial school. For the Archbishop of Philadelphia judged any school to be Catholic in which persons of Catholic faith and life taught Christian doctrine besides letters; Bishop McQuaid desired the establishment of many schools of this kind.[113] The Council naturally left it to the judgment of the Ordinary to determine what school was a Catholic school.[114]

The Council also gave thought to the improvement of Catholic journalism. Bishop McQuaid was appointed to the committee in charge of the matter.[115] The public decrees of the Council recommended one paper for each province to be supported financially by the Bishops of the Province if need be. A Catholic daily was also recommended for each large city, though it was not neces-

[111] [Private] *Acta et Decreta.* Congregat. 17 Privata, Feria IV, Die 26 November, p. lxii.

[112] [Public] *Acta et Decreta,* p. 100*sq*, No. 196.

[113] [Private] *Acta et Decreta.* Congregat. 18 Privata, Feria VI, Die 28 November, p. lxiv.

[114] [Public] *Acta et Decreta,* p. 104, No. 199.

[115] [Private] *Acta et Decreta.* Congregat. 20 Privata, Sabbato, Die 29 November P. M.

sary to go by the name of Catholic, provided it judiciously seized the occasion to defend Catholic doctrine from attack and calumny, and carefully kept from its readers news unfit to be read.[116] Past experience made the prelates of the Council warn the faithful against newspaper writers who claim the name Catholic for their organs, but use their opportunities to discredit the authorities governing the Church.[117] Writers of that character did not hesitate at times even to make use of the secular press for the same purpose. This, in fact, was the reason why Bishop McQuaid waxed indignant at the doings of a press agent in reporting to the *New York Sun* a discussion on church revenue within the Council in a way to put the action of some of the prelates in an odious light.[118] Although the reporter touched upon most of the points in the discussion, he omitted to mention one that was much debated on this occasion, namely, dancing connected with banquets for the promotion of pious works. Contrary to the opinions advanced by some, yet not without support from others, Bishop McQuaid declared that there was danger latent in passing too many and too rigorous laws. He thought that dancing could be safely indulged in, out in the country, under due safeguards, as otherwise the young folk would attend the dances of non-Catholics.[119] Nevertheless, the Council finally ordered priests to see to the total abolition of all banquets with balls for the promotion of pious works.[120]

Greater freedom was taken by the Council with the first chapter of Title VIII, which was originally headed "Of Italian Immigrants." It precipitated an earnest discussion that led to the significant change of this chapter to the more general title "Of Colonists and Immigrants." Bishop McQuaid and others thought that the whole chapter of the original Schema ought to be expunged; he saw no reason why they should be so solicitous of the Italians; care must be taken of all immigrants. Finally, a committee, composed of Archbishops Corrigan and Riordan, the

[116] [Public] *Acta et Decreta*, p. 126, No. 227.

[117] *Ibid.*, p. 129, No. 231.

[118] Copied from the *Sun* into the *London Tablet*. *Cf.* Bishop McQuaid to ——, January 28, 1886. Baltimore Cathedral Archives.

[119] [Private] *Acta et Decreta*. Congregat. 25 Privata, Feria IV, Die 3 December P. M., p. lxxxvi.

[120] [Public] *Acta et Decreta*, p. 167, No. 290.

Bishops of Rochester, Peoria, and New Orleans, was appointed to rewrite the whole chapter.[121]. A little later these prelates reported that they could speak but despairingly of Italian colonists, for whom no help could be hoped except through societies established in Italy itself. They therefore recommended writing to the Holy Father a clear statement of the whole Italian situation in this country.[122] Special care had also to be taken of the Negroes and Indians. The expenses of this work were to be provided for by a collection. Bishop McQuaid thought it better to have two collections in churches, one for these missions and the other for the parish, although, if the matter were understood by the people and only one collection was taken up, he thought a part of the collection might be retained for the church.[123] To expedite matters, the Archbishop of Cincinnati and the Bishop of Rochester advised the formation of a commission of prelates having Indians and Negroes in their dioceses; let them come to an agreement under the presidency of the Archbishop of San Francisco and form a law to be approved by the Council. This was also done.[124] Finally, under this Title VIII, the Council also dealt with the danger to Catholics from secret societies. The difficulty was to determine what societies were of this character. This was precisely the reason why there was so much discussion on the standing of the Ancient Order of Hibernians. Bishop McQuaid proposed a settlement of the question by the appointment of three bishops with instructions to inquire into the nature and character of this society and to report the results of their investigation to the Council. The Archbishops of Chicago, Philadelphia, and San Francisco were appointed to do this work, with whom then the Archbishop of Baltimore was also associated.[125] Bishop McQuaid referred thus to the results in writing later to Archbishop Corrigan:

> The Council very peremptorily declined to act in the matter under the suggestion of the Archbishops of Philadelphia, Chicago, St. Louis, and San Francisco, relegating the whole question to a committee composed of the archbishops of the country. Without their united action, as I understand

[121] [Private] *Acta et Decreta.* Congregat. 21 Privata, Feria II, Die 1 December, p. lxxi *sq.*

[122] *Ibid.*, Congregat. 27 Privata, Feria V, Die 4 December, P. M., p. xcii.

[123] *Ibid.*, Congregat. 21 Privata, Feria II, Die 1 December, p. lxxv.

[124] *Ibid.*, Congregat. 29 Privata, Feria VI, Die 5 December, P. M., p. xcvi.

[125] *Ibid.*, Congregat. 22 Privata, Feria II, 1 December, P. M., p lxxviii.

> the decision of the Council, nothing could be done. It is the *reserved privilege* of the archbishops, not individually, but in concert and in a body to examine and decide this question of the lawfulness or unlawfulness of the A. O. H. . . . I sought the assistance of the Council in putting an end to diversity of conduct on the part of bishops toward the A. O. H. The Council chose in preference to bury the business where I am inclined to think it will be buried.[126]

On the conclusion of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, it was necessary to obtain the approbation of Rome before the decrees could be promulgated as the law of the American Church. There was considerable misgiving about the action Rome would take in regard to some of the modifications of the Schema submitted to the Council for legislation. Bishops Dwenger and Moore were finally selected as envoys to present the Acts and Decrees of the Council to the authorities at Rome and to work for their approval, although there had been some talk of sending Bishops McQuaid and Gilmour. However, Bishop McQuaid wrote the latter, December 27, 1884: "I felt quite certain that after my action in the Ancient Order case I would be considered a dangerous man to send to Rome by their Graces of St. Louis, Philadelphia, and Chicago. I think they and others are a little afraid of me. Perhaps it is just as well for me not to go, but if Archbishop Corrigan and yourself could go, some good would certainly come out of your representation. If we cannot have a strong representation in members of our body, it would be better to have no one there. It will not answer for anyone to go unless officially. He would be snubbed and sent home. But we can write. I propose to write at length to Cardinal Simeoni soon after the departure of our envoys."[127] Under considerable pressure Bishop Gilmour was finally also duly accredited, and providentially so. Bishop Dwenger proved hopelessly unfit for the work; Bishop Moore lacked initiative, but ably seconded the efforts of Bishop Gilmour, who saved an important portion of the work of the Council by a direct appeal to the Holy Father.[128]

Soon after this Rome put Bishop McQuaid in charge of a case that gave him another opportunity to render signal services to the American Church. He informed Bishop Gilmour of it,

---

[126] March 15, 1886. *Bishops and Dignitaries, 1886-1887.* New York Archdiocesan Archives, Dunwoodie Seminary.

[127] Cleveland Diocesan Archives, No. 4, No. A, *Bishops from 1872 to 1888.*

[128] Bishop Gilmour to Bishop McQuaid, November 5, 1885. *Ibid., Letters,* Vol. v, October 3, 1884, to January 11, 1887; also *Protest of Bishops Moore and Gilmour,* October 3, 1885. *Ibid.,* No. 4, No. A, *Bishops from 1872 to 1888.*

January 14, 1886: "Rome sent me a case of a priest in the diocese of Albany against the parish where he had formerly been pastor to adjudicate definitely and without appeal. It has been in dispute about fourteen years. It has been and is still before the civil courts. Before taking up the case I required the plaintiff to withdraw the case from the secular courts. Of course he refused. So I sent back the case to Rome, as there was in this country a higher court than that of Rome to which recalcitrant priests might appeal against unfavorable sentences of ecclesiastical courts."[129] Bishop McQuaid pursued the matter further in writing to Bishop Gilmour, February 9, 1886: "You will do me and yourself a favor by sending me the names of priests that have within a few years past brought their bishops into the *civil* courts, either against them personally or churches under their care. Names, approximate dates at least, and leading features of the case; a few lines will suffice. I want to present as formidable an array as possible to Rome to lead to special legislation on this subject. I will write to half a dozen bishops that I can trust."[130] When the Memorial for Rome was duly prepared, Bishop Gilmour received a summary of its contents, April 17, 1886.

> It is a long document containing American law on the subject, twenty cases of clerics sueing bishops and church corporations, the scandals arising therefrom, and the heavy expenses incurred from such suits.
>
> The whole mischief has come from a faulty interpretation put on the 156th decree of the Second Plenary Council by our learned *American Canonists*. I write that if the 84th decree of the Third means no more than the other thus interpreted, the evil will grow in magnitude. It is quite sure, however, that Rome will come out with a very strong letter of Instruction, similar to the one published by the Sacred Penitentiary (?) through Cardinal Monaco, bearing date January 23, 1886, which no doubt you have seen.[131]

Bishop McQuaid's expectations were fully realized. On July 13, 1886, Cardinal Simeoni wrote him the decision of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda, which plainly declared that it would never admit the recourse or appeal of priests who dared to cite before lay judges either a cleric without the permission of the Ordinary or a bishop without the permission of the Holy See, whether in an ecclesiastical cause or not, unless they first abandoned the recourse taken to the civil court. According to the explanation of the chapter *Cogentes*, published by the

[129] *Ibid.*, No. 4, No. A, etc.
[130] *Ibid.*
[131] *Ibid.*

Congregation of the Inquisition, January 23, 1886, bishops can punish such clerics with penalties and censures *ferendae sententiae*, especially with suspension *a divinis*. If Ordinaries are asked for permission to convene a cleric before a lay court, they are not to refuse it, especially when they have tried in vain to settle the dispute between the parties contending.[132] This reply suited Bishop McQuaid, and on August 2, 1886, he wrote Bishop Gilmour: "I am acting on it in the case of O'Sullivan *vs.* St. Mary's Church of Hudson. It will cover the case of Early *vs.* St. Patrick's Church of Rochester. It turns out that his bishop is backing him bravely. I have always felt that Bishop Ryan was at the bottom of my trouble, but others are beginning to see it as well."[133] Bishop McQuaid had already written Bishop Gilmour the great general results he expected from the Propaganda's decision: "It will put a stop to civil suits in the future except by scalawags who contemn the Church."[134]

This did not end trouble between bishops and priests within the Church itself. Bishop McQuaid's main difficulty was Father Lambert, a man who had put not only Catholics but also positive Protestants deeply in debt to himself by his famous *Notes on Ingersoll*. A *Thesaurus Biblicus* with other writings, editorial labors on his own Waterloo paper, *The Catholic Times*, on the *Philadelphia Catholic Times*, finally on the *Freeman's Journal*, gave Father Lambert a prominent literary standing before the American public. In the Diocese of Rochester, however, since Bishop McQuaid's return from Rome in 1879, Father Lambert became an active factor in fostering trouble for the head of the diocese, sometimes openly, but more often secretely and insidiously. His conduct finally led Bishop McQuaid to confine his sphere of activity within the Diocese to very narrow limits by a letter dated April 7, 1881:

> I hereby restrict the exercise of your faculties to the limits of your mission of Waterloo.
>
> I also direct you not to be present at any other 40 hours' devotion than your own.
>
> For placing these restrictions on you there are excellent reasons which render them advisable and even necessary.[135]

---

[132] *Acta et Decreta Concil. Provin. Neo Eboracen*, IV, p. 85 *sq.*

[133] Cleveland Diocesan Archives, No. 4, No. A, *Bishops from 1872 to 1888*.

[134] Same to same, July 26, 1886. *Ibid.*

[135] New York Archdiocesan Archives, Metropolitan New York, Archbishop's House.

Father Lambert's appeal to the Cardinal Archbishop of New York, April 9, 1881, was not more successful than his appeal to the Propaganda three years later. The very next day after Bishop McQuaid received this decision from Rome, he informed Bishop Gilmour of its substance December 17, 1884: "The Bishop is not obliged to grant faculties to a priest for the whole diocese; and can consequently limit them to a particular mission."[136] Father Lambert now waited till March 20, 1888, before he again had recourse to Rome. Then he addressed his letter of complaint to Cardinal Simeoni, the Prefect of the Propaganda. The latter naturally corresponded with Bishop McQuaid, who finally put down his own demands in the case, May 16, 1888:

1. Rev. Mr. Lambert must apologize to the Vicar-General of the Diocese and to the former Rector of the Cathedral for the insults offered them in his newspaper.
2. He must acknowledge before the priests of the Diocese that he did not know that I was the writer of the articles signed "A Catholic," and consequently that he did not intend to designate me as a *Tartuffe, an immoral hypocrite.*
3. A transfer to another mission is demanded in behalf of the temporal and spiritual interests of his present charge.
4. A check upon his disposition to form parties and create factions in the diocese is necessary.
5. In view of the fact that Rev. Mr. Lambert was never properly released from Alton, the diocese of his ordination, it would be better for him to go back to it, or if this arrangement cannot be made, let him go to some other diocese for whose bishop he may be able to have more respect than he has for the Bishop of Rochester.[137]

The reply from Rome was anything but what had been expected by Father Lambert and his expert adviser, Dr. Burtsell. Cardinal Simeoni sent his letter, dated July 31, 1888, to Father Lambert through Bishop McQuaid. The Prefect of the Propaganda wrote:

After receiving your appeal against the Bishop of Rochester, opportune information was gathered which has furnished elements sufficient for pronouncing judgment. Already in August, 1884, a letter was sent to you setting aside your claim, and now after your last deductions the decision then rendered is in no way to be modified. However, there are many reasons for not receiving your appeal. Among those which might be adduced, it will suffice to note the following. You know well that those ordained "*titulo missionis*" must obtain the permission of this Sacred Congregation in order to be released from their diocese and admitted into another, as appears from a decree of this same Congregation given on the 4th of February, 1873, and transcribed in the Appendix of the III Council of Baltimore, page 210. If one thus ordained *titulo missionis* has taken the oath to serve a certain diocese, then the simple permission of the Sacred Congregation does not suffice, but a dispensation must then be obtained. Now from the documents transmitted by you to this Sacred Congregation it does not appear that you have fulfilled the afore-

[136] Cleveland Diocesan Archives, No. 4, No. A, *Bishops from 1872 to 1888.*

[137] Original draft in my possession.

said prescriptions and of a consequence you are not legally incorporated in the Diocese of Rochester, but remain as yet bound to the Diocese of Alton. Affairs standing thus, you have no right to advance any complaint against Monsignor McQuaid's method of procedure in your regard.[138]

As soon as Bishop McQuaid had ascertained the fact that Father Lambert had been ordained for the Alton Diocese and had not obtained the permission of the Propaganda to change to another diocese, he dismissed Father Lambert from the Diocese of Rochester.[139] When Father Lambert pursued his case personally at Rome, whither Bishop McQuaid had also gone for this business as well as for his decennial visit *ad limina*, the Propaganda had to admit a legal mistake in applying to Father Lambert's case a law which had been passed years after his ordination. Otherwise Bishop McQuaid had a strong case against Father Lambert, who failed to be reinstated in Waterloo, and had to make an act of submission, but in rather general terms: "Hereby I retract fully and without reserve whatever I have written directly or indirectly against the said Rt. Rev. Bishop, and hereby I want to repair the scandal in this my act of retractation of the said writings."[140]

Even this did not stop Father Lambert's old tactics of covert attacks and insinuations against Bishop McQuaid. One of these had to do with the Bishop's attitude towards the newly established Apostolic Delegation at Washington. Before its actual establishment Bishop McQuaid was not in favor of such an institution. As early as February 15, 1877, he wrote Bishop Corrigan:

The "Apostolic Delegate" business is a very serious one, and one destined to make trouble if followed up. Instead of keeping our warm love for Rome, it will have a contrary effect. The only reason for the change that I have heard has been to lessen appeals to Rome. Will he lessen them? I doubt it. But he will have complied with certain forms of procedure better than bishops now comply with them, Rome will have to take into account our peculiar condition and adapt her regulations to it. The attempt to carry out the requirements of the *old* canon law will end in disaster to religion. Protestants now congratulate us on our method of washing our dirty linen at home and out of sight of strangers. Of course priests have a right to justice, and to exemption from injustice on the part of a bishop, old, feeble, or likely to be

---

[138] Copy of original in my possession; *cf. Lambert's Summarium*, p. 38 *sq.*

[139] Bishop McQuaid to Cardinal Simeoni, October 15, 1888. Original draft in my possession.

[140] MENGHINI, *Memorial to the Propaganda*, p. 2; copy in my possession. Cf. an interesting review of the case, hostile to Bishop McQuaid, by Dr. Edward McGlynn in his Address on *Father Lambert, A Priest Who Went to Rome and What He Got There*, delivered before the Anti-poverty Society, 27 Cooper Union, New York City, July 28, 1889, published in the Society's Addresses No. 42, Friday, August 2, 1889.

deceived when trusting to his own judgment. The more quiet the way in which the examination or trial takes place, the better for religion and the priest, provided the latter has been sufficiently protected against a mistaken or false judgment.

Has Rome any conception of our difficulty in obtaining evidence against an accused priest among the Irish people? . . . Witnesses who are willing to appear before a bishop will not present themselves before a body of priests. At least let Rome proceed cautiously before imposing on us an iron clad form to go by . . . So if you have an opportunity, give them some plain talk. They hear too much that is according to their own preconceived notions of what ought to be, and not enough of the unpleasant truths concerning our actual condition and difficulties. An "Apostolic Delegate" will in my judgment be an unmitigated misfortune. Sycophants will gather around him and use him. Let us be as we are. Still I hold that justice demands that a priest should have a right to a trial by his brother priests whenever accused of a crime for which the bishop proposes to punish him. The mode of this trial makes the difficulty.[141]

The very next year Bishop McQuaid wrote to a prominent American prelate from Rome, December 10, 1878: "My repugnance to a permanent Delegate arises from other reasons chiefly than the one you name. The political reason is a strong one, but the other reasons weigh more with me. I will use all judicious efforts with all suitable persons from the Pope down to put a stop to this Delegate arrangement."[142] When, however, Bishop McQuaid heard a little later that another Delegate would be sent to Canada, "who will also be commissioned to take a look at things in the U. S., but without any official character in our country," he declared: "I do not blame the Propaganda for sending these agents inasmuch as no one says a word against their doing so, while some American bishops favor the plan. To me it is most offensive, but I have not spoken against it because of the unofficial character he is to hold."[143] The "Delegate business" apparently went into abeyance for a time. During the preparations for the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore some misgiving was felt lest a foreigner be appointed to preside over it, and it was with considerable satisfaction to many that the Archbishop of Baltimore was appointed to that position with the rank of Apostolic Delegate. After the Council the issue became vital again. Bishop Dwenger was then mentioned as a candidate. Bishop McQuaid "did not at first intend to do aught. I was simply disgusted with the whole affair. . . However,f or the honor of

[141] Bishops to M. A. C., 1865–1883. New York Archdiocesan Archives, Dunwoodie Seminary.

[142] Baltimore Cathedral Archives, No. 55.

[143] *Ibid.*

the Holy See I did write a letter to Rome which may serve to open people's eyes with regard to the fitness of the candidate." A little later Bishop McQuaid declared: "Dwenger's chance is not great. It was the intention of Rome to appoint him, but I think that a change has come over them in the Eternal City."[144] When Bishop Gilmour made known his candidates for the position, Rochester, Boston, or New York, Bishop McQuaid replied with a touch of humor: "There is less chance of my appointment [than Dwenger's]; so I do not worry. I am too pleasantly situated where I am to covet any other position or more responsibility. Still I thank you for your good opinion of my humble self. Boston or New York would be the right man."[145] For Bishop Gilmour's benefit Bishop McQuaid cited, February 20, 1887, a pertinent passage from a letter of one of his Roman correspondents of good authority. This personage wrote: "I do not consider it likely from the appearance of things at present that the Delegate will be an American. The idea seems to be to erect in the U. S. a branch of the Propaganda as is done for Turkey, to be presided over by one of themselves. For the present the branch would have no diplomatic character, and very likely its first seat will not be Washington in order to excite no fears."[146] Bishop McQuaid quite agreed with Bishop Gilmour "that the 'branch' will be established here with an Italian at its head. They want to see with their own eyes, so they say. Anything would be better than Dwenger."[147] Finally, after some years an Apostolic Delegation was established at Washington with no official political standing and with Msgr. Satolli at its head. The expense of building a fitting home for the establishment naturally fell to the lot of the American Catholic Church, and the following characteristic letter gives proof of Bishop McQuaid's earnest cooperation in the work.

ROCHESTER, N.Y., *April* 12, 1894.

Most Eminent Cardinal:

At the close of the last year I addressed a letter to the priests of Rochester diocese of which I inclose your Eminence a copy.

Early in February a check for $600 was sent, but as no receipt has come

---

[144] Bishop McQuaid to Bishop Gilmour, January 26 and 31, 1887. Cleveland Diocesan Archives, No. 4, No. A, *Bishops from 1872 to 1888*.

[145] *Ibid.*, January 31, 1887.

[146] *Ibid.*, February 20, 1887.

[147] *Ibid.*, February 25, 1887.

back, it is safe to say that the letter has miscarried. A duplicate check is now mailed, wishing it better luck.

In establishing a pro-rata for this diocese and for the churches in the diocese I assumed that the Catholic population of the country was at least 8,000,000. It is generally estimated at from ten to twelve millions. Six and a quarter mills on eight millions will give the fifty thousand dollars needed. The smallest Catholic population in any diocese will be found to be in North Carolina and Cheyenne, each having about 3,000. The pro-rata for each, at 6¼ mills, would be $18.75. The poorest diocese could pay this amount without much sacrifice.

It is a great pity that the Archbishops at their meeting in Chicago did not determine on the arrangement they have now come to. What might have been brought about at once now drags along and much will never be gathered in satisfactorily.

Your Eminence will remember that in my letter asking for information as to the cost of the Delegation-House, I stated what I proposed to do. In making known its cost you also expressed approval of the plan. The Cath. Pop. of this diocese is not over 80,000. At 6¼ mills our pro-rata would be $500. I have put the amount at $600. The extra $100 will pay for North Carolina, Saint Augustine, and Charleston.

When the inclosed circular letter was sent to the priests of the diocese, although the heading made it a private letter, Rev. Mr. Lambert, whom my brother bishops have been busy patting on the back ever since he gave exhibition of coarse blackguardianism in assaults on his own bishop, in the style of Phelan of the *Western Watchman*, published in the *Catholic Times* of Philadelphia the latter part of the letter, criticising very severely my method of raising this fund for the Delegation-House.

I am glad that it is the only way in which the money can be got together.

I have the honor to remain,

Your Eminence's Obt. Servt.

B. J. McQuaid.[148]

This generous liberality on the part of Bishop McQuaid is all the more striking, as he had more than one reason to complain of the conduct of the first Apostolic Delegate, who for a time was under the influence of persons taking advantage of their position of trust to mislead him. Worst of all was the crisis he precipitated in the Catholic School Question. When Bishop McCloskey of Louisville read the text of his communication to the Archbishops of the United States, he honestly confessed to Archbishop Corrigan, December 8, 1892: "I fear that, if authoritative, it is the death blow to a certain extent of our Catholic schools."[149] Bishop McQuaid expressed the same conviction in writing to the same Archbishop, December 13, 1892:

> We are all in a nice pickle, thanks to Leo XIII and his delegate.
>
> Just as our arduous work of the last forty years was beginning to bear ample fruit, they arbitrarily upset the whole. If an enemy had done this!
>
> Yesterday an English translation of Mgr. Satolli's address to the Archbishops came to hand. Apparently it was sent from Philadelphia from a priest who has differed with me on the School Question.
>
> It is only a question of time, when present Roman legislation having

[148] Letters to ——, Baltimore Cathedral Archives, No. 55, Mc.

[149] 1892. Bishops to M. A. C. New York Archdiocesan Archives, Archbishop's House.

wrought incalculable mischief, that we, school-children of the hierarchy, will again receive a lesson in our Catechism from another Italian sent out to enlighten us.

The lessons of Satolli's pamphlet (private and confidential) do not apply to the diocese of Rochester where the parochial schools are not only equal but much superior to the public schools.

The Professor in Faribault, whose communication to the *Christian Union* is published in the last number of the *Catholic Herald*, together with the description of the Stillwater school which appeared in the *Chicago Herald*, ought to be translated into Italian, and sent in large numbers to Rome. Joined to this publication should be extracts from Archbishop Ireland's *Memorial*. It would show the good people over there how shamefully they were led astray by misrepresentations.[150]

Things were not so bad as they first looked to zealous promoters of the Catholic Parochial School System. Leo XIII sent a letter to the United States, asking the prelates of the Catholic Church for their opinion on the school question. Bishop McQuaid's answer is dated January 16, 1893, and representations such as advanced in this letter saved the Catholic schools from the disaster that seemed to be threatening them. Bishop McQuaid wrote:

I thank your Holiness for the opportunity given me to write upon a subject that gravely concerns the spiritual welfare of our Catholic people in the United States, and about which their minds and souls are at present greatly disturbed.

After the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore we had peace in the Church, and all, bishops, priests, and people, seemed intent on promoting the establishment of Catholic schools as rapidly as possible. The first note of alarm came from a dangerous address delivered at St. Paul before a Convention of State School Teachers. This address of Archbishop Ireland pained and bewildered all who had followed carefully the School Question as it has been discussed in America. Already many efforts had been made to effect a compromise with the State on a basis that would protect the faith and morals of our Catholic children. These efforts have invariably failed of adequate success. On such a basis as that of Faribault and Stillwater, actually put into effect in those towns, it would be easy in many places to bring about an adoption of our Catholic schools as State or Public Schools, but it would be by a complete sacrifice of the Catholic education and training of our children.

The only arrangement that is now possible between the State and Church on this question is one that entirely surrenders our rights, and that puts our schools on a par with the State Schools from which the inculcation of morals based on religious motives is altogether excluded. Whenever the Catholic Church is ready to substitute the natural for the supernatural in religion the time will have arrived for passing over our Schools to State control.

What we have most of all to dread is not the direct teaching of the State Schools, it is the indirect teaching which is the most insiduous and the most dangerous. It is the moral atmosphere, the tone of thought permeating these schools that give cause for alarm. It is the indifferentism with regard to all religious beliefs we most of all fear. This is the dominant heresy that, imbibed in youth, can scarcely ever be eradicated. It is one that already has in our large towns and cities decimated Protestant churches. It is one that will decimate our churches if not checked in time. Indifferentism with regard to all religious ends is rank infidelity.

Associations in schools, especially in State schools, where all classes, Protestants, Jews, and Infidels, meet promiscuously, present another danger.

[150] *Ibid.*

In a State school all the children of these classes living within the school district are to be found. Watchful Christian parents would never allow their children to associate with such at other times, justly fearing contamination. Yet in State schools their children sit on the same benches with them, and meet them on the playground. Many Protestant parents refuse to send their children to State schools on account of this exposure, preferring private schools. Catholic children in attendance at Catholic schools frequent the sacraments regularly, especially Penance, in which a safeguard is found for purity. When not in Catholic schools experience has shown that only a small number, and these of pious families, can be brought to confession. Other children, not Catholic, have no such protection for morality and esteem purity under a laxer system of intercourse between the sexes as less sacred. These associations, ripening into friendships, lead in time to mixed marriages, the growing evil of our time and country.

Experience has also demonstrated that Catholic children brought up in State schools lose the spirit of the Catholic religion; their thoughts and speech are tinctured with a liberalism that borders on infidelity. A common remark among this class is: All religions are good enough or one religion is as good as another.

I speak with knowledge derived from an experience of forty-five years in the priesthood in this my native country, of which nearly twenty-five have been in the episcopate. The maintenance of Catholic schools demands of bishops, priests, and people great sacrifices, much labor, and a large expenditure of money. I have always believed that the cause of Catholic education was worthy of such sacrifices. I believe it all the more strongly now that I have read what your Holiness says to the Italian people in the Encyclical of December 8.

For many years past I have felt that in this country the Catholic school was as necessary for the children as the church was for them and their parents. For although the chief mission of the Church is to preach the Gospel of Christ, yet there is little likelihood of that Gospel reaching and abiding in the hearts of the children except through the instrumentality of the schoolhouse. Indeed it will be useless to build churches that in one or two generations hence will be vacant because children or grandchildren of European parents no longer follow the religion of their ancestors. If the Church in the United States has already lost so many of her children, it is due in large degree to the want of Catholic schools.

I also beg your Holiness to note that, in discussing the question of State or Government in America, it is necessary to bear in mind that the State, in so far as it is an executive body for the administration of the political affairs of the country, is a creature of the people, and it cannot go counter to the wishes and will of the people. Hence until the people are educated up to a sense of rendering justice to their Catholic fellow-citizens in their schools, it is useless to appeal to what is called the State or Government. In certain localities people may be more intelligent and more just and better disposed to admit our right to provide a Christian education for our children than in others. Just yet the people at large are not prepared to concede to us our just rights, while they are much more so than they were twenty or fifty years ago. The acceptance from them of anything less than our full rights, except as a temporary compromise, would be a misfortune for the church in America. There should be no compromise at any time that sacrifices the right of our children to a Christian education.

With the remarks respectfully offered to your Holiness, I now proceed to animadvert on the fourteen propositions of Mgr. Satolli placed before the Archbishops on the 17th of November last [1892].

1. Of the first five propositions, which are taken from the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, remark need to be made only on the 5th. This is a portion of the paragraph in which it is found, and by omitting the preceding part conveys the idea that under no circumstances can absolution be refused to parents who persist in sending their children to State schools. This is the interpretation put on it by the Protestant newspapers of the country, which rejoice greatly at the victory gained in their favor. It is also received favorably by Catholic priests and people who side with the prevailing liberalism of

the day. If it is the correct interpretation, then all further argument is of no avail, and the sooner we abandon all effort to save religion the better. But I do not believe that this is the mind of the Holy See, and for the following reasons:

(*a*) The contrary is taught in the *Instructio* of November 24, 1875.

(*b*) There is always great danger to faith and morals in public schools from which all religion is excluded, if not from the direct teaching, then from association with the classes that frequent the State schools.

(*c*) Scarcely ever do parents, who place their children in State schools, regularly provide for the religious instruction of their children at home.

(*d*) When parents have in their vicinity Catholic schools equal in every respect and often superior to the State schools, and yet favor the latter against the advice of pastor and bishop, they are in a state of sinful contumacy, and ought to be refused absolution until they repent.

(*e*) The unreproved contumacious conduct of a few will after awhile break down our entire system of church schools.

(*f*) In Belgium and other countries of Europe parents who send their children to State schools are refused absolution until they withdraw them.

2. With regard to Section No. 6, I would add after "*quas Status moderatur,*" provided the faith and morals of Catholic children are safeguarded as in the Catholic denominational schools of England, etc. The quotation from the Baltimore Council ought to be complete, and include these words: "*nisi forte Ordinarius in casu particulari aliud permitti posse judicet.*"

3. In relation to No. 7, I remark that all attempts on the part of bishops in the past to improve the State schools have been followed by eliminating from them all traces of Christianity as found in the various Protestant sects and substituting therefor what was worse, infidelity.

4. The second paragraph of the eighth section supposes that what it demands for the safe Catholic education of our children is attainable under our present State School System. This is a fallacy. The American people are not in a frame of mind to concede what is essential to the end in view. In certain localities more favorable arrangements may be made than in others. There is one such place in my diocese [Lima]. The teachers are religious appointed by the bishop; they undergo the required examination of the State as to competency in secular branches of learning; the pupils are all the Catholic children of the parish, living near enough to the school, without regard to State school districts or limits; there are never more than two or three non-Catholic children in this school. By the open confession of the State School Commissioner for the county these Sisters are the most competent, and the children of this school are the most polite and best behaved of any State school in the country. And yet we are not altogether satisfied. There is something lacking in the religious tone of the school, and the children do not get all they have a right to.

5. With regard to the first part of Section IX, I beg to say that this diocese has provided Catholic schools in every parish where it is possible to have them; that these schools are in buildings, equipments, and the capacity of their teachers equal to and, it is generally admitted, superior to the State schools in the same localities. Where we have no parochial schools at the present time, we propose to have them just as soon as possible, if this present disturbance does not throw us back for some years.

We have always had Catechism classes for all our children in all the parishes of the diocese.

6. With regard to Section X, I would ask, if the second sentence permits parents to place their children, daughters especially, in non-Catholic boarding schools, when there are superior Convents under the direction of Religious safer and better in every sense of the word at their service. This sentence in Section X has a dangerous sound.

7. Anyone acquainted with our country and its people knows that the time has not come for an arrangement with the State in relation to our rights in this matter of school education. If the proposed arrangement is one by which we are to hand over our schools to the State to be de-Catholicized and made hot-beds of indifferentism with regard to all religion, we can move in this matter, for on this basis non-Catholics will readily meet us. The less we

have to do with the State the better, until the State is ready to come to us with propositions that will protect the Catholicity of our schools and leave us our rights as Catholics and citizens. In the meantime it is better for us to bear with injustice and wrong, and preserve our virility and independence. This is what I have to say respecting Section XI.

8. Any remarks that I might make on Section XII have already been expressed in the above statements.

9. Section XIII. It does not seem fair to require our teachers to undergo examinations before the State authorities until the State is prepared to acknowledge our just rights. The examinations required by the Ordinary ought to suffice. I think it is putting an indignity on our Religious to ask this of them. In this diocese, our school children voluntarily stand the same examinations to which the State school children are subjected, and when our children show better results, as they uniformly do, it ought to be satisfactory to all that their teachers are competent. Our Catholic people are perfectly satisfied with their schools, and intelligent Protestants admit their superiority.

I sum up by saying:

1. In a country like ours, whose form of government depends on the people, the less interference with our natural rights we concede to what is called the State the better. Later on, when our country becomes less Christian and more infidel, greater concessions will be demanded. All concessions in time acquire the force of rights.

2. Confessional, or denominational schools, such as they have in Canada and England, might answer in places where we cannot do better.

3. In my judgment, it may be generations before the American people will be disposed to listen to the adoption of confessional schools.

4. In the meantime our only alternative is to establish parochial schools wherever we can, and to raise the standard of secular education above that of the State schools, while not neglecting the religious care of those children who are obliged to go to the public schools because there are no parochial schools in their neighborhood.

5. Msgr. Satolli's propositions concede too much.[151]

Despite Bishop McQuaid's activities in behalf of the Parochial School System and his trenchant criticism of the Public School System, he was picked by friends as a candidate for nomination as Regent of the University of the State of New York. He declared January 19, 1894: "At first I was disposed to have nothing to do with regard to this affair, but since it appears that Malone and Lambert are candidates, it becomes a duty to allow my name to be used, even if I should meet with defeat. All I care about is to defeat these two." In regard to the former, he found ample reason to dispute his candidacy in "what Malone is reported in the *Brooklyn Eagle* as saying. A man's worst enemy is always one of his household." These things were so grave that he asked Archbishop Corrigan: "Ought not Bishop McDonnell to bring to the notice of the Delegate what Malone says about parochial schools, etc.?"[152] Two months later, on the return of a friend from Albany, Bishop McQuaid informed his

[151] Original draft in my possession.

[152] Bishop McQuaid to Archbishop Corrigan, January 19, 1894. 1894, Bishops, etc., New York Archdiocesan Archives, Archbishop's House.

Archbishop that "the prospect there is that Malone will get the election for Regent. His friends, and they include all the clerical cranks of the State, have been working heaven and earth against me. Lambert is working for him." Bishop McQuaid's friend, Mayor Curran of Rochester, a Republican, found "that while the leaders are not opposed to me, the county members have been won over by misrepresentations, etc."[153] There were also other influences brought to bear upon the election against Bishop McQuaid in favor of Malone. He judged it all important to find out all about the outside clerical meddlers in the affairs of this State. "Archbishop Ireland is one, but there are others. I shall not be surprised to learn that among them are some of the University professors. It is just what N. N. would do."[154] However, the most active of all these was the first named who "began to write letters and send telegrams to prominent Republican politicians in favor of Malone." Bishop McQuaid made use of all his powers of expression to make Cardinal Ledochowski later understand the nature of Archbishop Ireland's intervention.

> These letters and telegrams were handed around to politicians in New York City and in the halls of the Legislature at Albany, and were used to destroy all legitimate influence the Archbishop and Suffragans might have in their own State. We are represented as Democrats in politics while Mgr. Ireland was a Republican. No one had a right to designate me as belonging to any party, for ever since my consecration as bishop I have abstained absolutely from all dabbling in politics, and belonged to no party. So far as I know, my brother bishops have been equally cautious. The Rev. Mr. Malone was in no sense a proper representative of the Catholic body; he was not acceptable to the bishops of the State; he would not be able to do us any good while he might do us much harm as Regent; his ideas with regard to parochial schools were not in harmony with Catholic teaching; he publicly in the newspapers showed great contempt for his Ordinary, the bishop of Brooklyn.[155]

The political campaign of 1894 ended in a Republican victory. Bishop McQuaid frankly confessed to Archbishop Corrigan, November 7, 1894: "The Democrats have gone under overwhelmingly. The fate of the amendments, though not certain, in all likelihood follows the party. The course of Ireland and Malone helped some, but the party was past saving. The Republicans themselves had no idea how great their victory was to be."[156] However, before the elections circumstances were such that the Republican Party was glad to have the services of a man like

[153] Same to same, March 23, 1894. *Ibid.*

[154] Same to same, March 31, 1894. *Ibid.*

[155] *c.* February, 1895. Original draft in my possession.

[156] 1894, *Bishops, etc.* New York Archdiocesan Archives, Archbishop's House.

Archbishop Ireland. The Democratic Party in their Convention had openly and forcibly disavowed the leading principles of the A. P. A., which the Republican Convention refused to do. Besides the Constitutional Convention with a large Republican majority adopted an amendment forbidding all support of denominational, also therefore of parochial schools, out of public money. Nevertheless, the Archbishop of St. Paul personally intervened in favor of the Republican Party in the State of New York.

> Archbishop Ireland came to Philadelphia in the beginning of October, 1894, to be present at a meeting of the Archbishops and, going to New York, remained there and in the neighborhood until the end of November, returning to St. Paul just in time for the First Sunday of Advent. While he was in New York, the electioneering campaign was at fever heat. Both parties were holding public meetings. The Republicans held two such meetings, at which Ireland was present, occupying a conspicuous seat on the rostrum among the speakers and leaders of the party. These facts were duly recorded in the newspapers of the following day. . . . Then a few days before the election, he prepared a paper in favor of the Republican Party, in which he sophistically argued that we should not bring religion into politics, etc. This paper, together with a letter by the Rev. Mr. Malone, and a most bitter anti-Catholic speech directed chiefly against our Catholic Schools among the Indians by the Hon. Mr. Linton was printed and circulated by hundred of thousands of copies throughout the State by agents of the Republican Party, a few days before the election, too late for a refutation of the sophistries of the Catholic Archbishop.[157]

Bishop McQuaid waxed still more indignant when he heard from New York that "after the election a very large sum of money was apparently loaned, but really given by the grateful Republicans to Archbishop Ireland to help him out of his financial difficulties, occasioned by his speculation in lands and railroad stocks."[158] Bishop McQuaid determined to call a halt to such proceedings, and on November 25, 1894, read a public protest in his Cathedral that was spread throughout the country by the public press. The next day he informed Archbishop Corrigan: "It is to the point, and its meaning will be clear to all. I did not mince matters."[159] Cardinal Rampolla wrote Bishop McQuaid later what great pain this public attack on an archbishop had caused the Holy Father, and Cardinal Ledochowski referred the examination of the affair to the Archbishop of New York. Bishop McQuaid replied to Cardinal Rampolla that he would

---

[157] Bishop McQuaid to Cardinal Ledochowski, *c.* February, 1895. Original draft in my possession.

[158] *Ibid.*

[159] *Bishops, etc.*, 1894. New York Archdiocesan Archives, Archbishop's House.

detail the motives of his attack in a letter to the Prefect of the Propaganda, Cardinal Ledochowski, who could then explain the whole matter to the Holy Father, as Roman Authorities would thus come to understand under what circumstances Bishop McQuaid acted as he did.[160] Bishop McQuaid wrote in part:

> I felt it to be a duty of conscience to speak out publicly against the irregular doings of Mgr. Ireland. I was willing to expose myself to abuse, and even censure, in the hope of checking a growing danger to the Church. I am willing to suffer so that the Church can be guarded. Mgr. Ireland's offence was public, the Catholic laity were shocked and scandalized, the members of the Democratic Party, Catholic and non-catholic, were angry beyond measure at this introduction of a new element, the paid services of a Catholic Archbishop, into political wranglings and warfare. The general silence seemed to them like acquiescence. They now know that Mgr. Ireland's political methods are not approved by all, unless the Holy See should decide that they are commendable.[161]

Two years later, when Bishop McQuaid received the Brief from Rome transferring four counties from the Diocese of Buffalo to the Diocese of Rochester, he could not help remarking: "Evidently over there in Rome they can't bear me much ill-will for the lecture I gave Ireland, or they would not enlarge the diocese of Rochester in my lifetime."[162] Subsequently, events wrought a change in Archbishop Ireland, if we can believe Bishop McQuaid's words addressed to his Metropolitan, September 19, 1896: "Archbishop Ireland's conversion is just in time. I hope it will be permanent."[163] The Faribault and Stillwater arrangements, which Rome decided could be tolerated, but did not approve despite persistent mistranslation of Latin words, came to an untimely end as all such earlier arrangements in the State of New York. Later in life, Archbishop Ireland's championship of the Catholic School System could not be more pronounced than it was. Fortunately, an interchange of visits by the two prelates to their respective episcopal cities made these two prominent members of the American Hierarchy drop the old spirit of animosity towards each other, and work together more closely for God and his Church.

While the New York State Constitutional Convention of 1894

---

[160] Bishop McQuaid to Cardinal Rampolla. Original draft of translation in my possession. Archbishop Corrigan to Bishop McQuaid, January 16, 1895. Material for Corrigan Life. New York Archdiocesan Archives, Archbishop's House.

[161] *c.* February, 1895. Original draft in my possession.

[162] Bishop McQuaid to Archbishop Corrigan, January 20, 1897. New York Archdiocesan Archives, Archbishop's House.

[163] 1896, *Bishops and Dignitaries. Ibid.*

cut off all possibility of support for the parochial schools out of public money, it refused to follow the same policy towards Catholic and other denominational charitable institutions. It did this despite the amendment framed under the influence of the "National League for the Protection of American Institutions," which declared: "No law shall be passed respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, nor shall the State, or any county, city, town, village, or other civil division use its property or credit or any money raised by taxation or otherwise, or aiding by appropriation, payment for services, expenses, or in any other manner, any church, religious denomination, or religious society, or any institution, society, or undertaking which is wholly or in part under sectarian or ecclesiastical control." By its rejection diocesan charitable institutions—the Boys' and the Girls' Orphan asylums that Bishop McQuaid found established on his arrival in Rochester and later rebuilt on an enlarged scale, St. Ann's Home for the Aged, St. Mary's Hospital, continued to receive opportune State aid to supplement their main support derived from Catholics. Even the school teachers in the Asylums are salaried by the State despite the persevering efforts of a prominent Rochester A. P. A., that only ceased with death, to prevent the State authorities from doing so. The State also continued to support Catholic chaplains in its penal and eleemosynary institutions, and the example of the State was and is rivalled in this matter at Rochester by both county and municipality. This condition of affairs was not always thus.

The most serious problem along these lines was offered by the Western House of Refuge established at Rochester for the reformation of juvenile delinquents. Previous to Bishop McQuaid's arrival in Rochester, efforts to obtain the right of worship and Catholic instruction for the Catholic boys confined there had failed. When Bishop McQuaid brought the matter before the managers of the institution, he received considerable support from some, but encountered too much opposition from others to be successful.[164] The Protestant chaplain continued his ministration to

[164] November Quarterly meeting, 1869; committee meeting, December 4 and 30, 1869; managers' meeting, January 4, 1870; *Rochester Union and Advertiser*, November 17, 1869 and January 5, 1870.

all, both Catholics and Protestants, claiming to give only general moral instruction, which the Catholic managers nevertheless knew to be sectarian. These men tried in vain to make their opponents realize what a powerful factor for good Catholic worship and instruction were in the reformation of Catholic wayward boys. Peculiar circumstances brought about a better appreciation of this at the Alms House according to the report the Protestant chaplain, the Rev. Dr. Van Ingen, made to the Supervisors:

> It is well known that a very large proportion of the inmates of your Alms House are foreign born, and that most of these are in religious faith Roman Catholics. It is a part of their education to make much of attendance once each Sunday at the public worship of their church; and it had been customary to indulge many of them in going to the city on Sunday morning for this purpose. The results from their yielding to the solicitations of appetite or the false kindness of acquaintances were subversive of the order and discipline of the House; and an effectual remedy was found in the rule laid down by the present officers and rigidly enforced, forbidding absence on Sundays, in conjunction with an offer of the chapel on Sundays for religious services by a minister of their own faith. Such services were held in consequence in the chapel at an early hour on Sunday morning by Father Baraffi, a R. C. clergyman of courteous manners and earnest devotion to his work, under appointment from his bishop, beginning in March last and suspended when the chapel became a dormitory in the autumn.
>
> The influence of this arrangement upon the good order of the House has often been attested by the Officers in charge.[185]

New tactics were now adopted by Bishop McQuaid in regard to the Western House of Refuge. He tried to have pastors obtain the signatures of the boys' parents and guardians to a petition in behalf of the Rights of Conscience of their boys. Finally, the following petition was presented to the Managers at their regular quarterly meeting, August, 1874:

> The undersigned parents and guardians of boys now in the Western House of Refuge, and professing the Catholic religion, respectfully petition the Managers of said institution to permit the holding of religious exercises in harmony with the religious belief of these boys. Knowing that the teachings and influence of religion will do more to make permanent the reformation sought in the House of Refuge than any other means, we urge our request that these boys shall not be deprived of so great a help to present and future good conduct, and shall not be debarred from the free exercise of religion guaranteed by the Constitutions of the United States and the State of New York.[186]

The Constitution of the United States, Article I of the Amendments, declared that "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The Constitution of the State of New York, Article I, Section 3, made a more pertinent declaration: "The free exer-

---

[185] *Rochester Union and Advertiser*, January 8, 1873.

[186] *Rochester Union and Advertiser*, August 19 and November 30, 1874.

cise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship shall forever be allowed in this State to all mankind." On the motion of Manager Purcell the petition was referred to a committee of three to consider and report at the next meeting. Managers Purcell, Andrews, and Chapin were appointed to the committee, which submitted a Majority Report signed by E. R. Andrews and Louis Chapin and a Minority Report signed by Wm. Purcell in the November meeting. The Majority Report maintained (1) "that to invite the religious teachers of all sects to hold separate religious exercises in the House of Refuge would be subversive of all discipline and fraught only with evil;" (2) that "if there are any rights resting with individuals in regard to religion, they rest with the children, not with the parents and guardians." Its signers therefore recommended "that the request be not complied with, but that an invitation be extended to the clergy of all denominations to visit the institution and to address the boys on topics of practical life, morality, and religion at such times as may be consistent with the duties of the boys under the direction of the Superintendent or the Board of Managers." The Minority Report thoroughly treated the issue both from the legal and the moral point of view. The opinion of Judge Selden was sought by Mr. Purcell and upheld the rights of Catholic boys to Catholic worship in the institution in which they were confined. Precedents for this were gathered by him from "the practice and experience of other reformatories and other prisons both in this and other countries." All this led to the formulation of the resolution: "That the prayer of the petition of parents and guardians of Catholic children confined in the Western House of Refuge for freedom of religious profession and worship be and is hereby granted in such manner and under such rules and regulations as the Acting Committee may prescribe." The resolution was modified so as to grant the requested Catholic worship "under the rules and regulations of the institution" and "in the chapel and under the direction of our superintendent" with the Catholic clergy to "be appointed by this Board." The modified resolution was adopted by a vote of eleven against two. Even one of the signers of the Majority Report, Mr. Chapin, cast his vote in its favor.[167] The March meeting, 1875, accordingly elected two

[167] *Union and Advertiser*, November 30, 1874.

chaplains, one Catholic and the other Protestant.[168] While Mr. William Purcell was perfectly competent to put together the Minority Report, its methods are largely those followed by Bishop McQuaid in his great lectures on Free Christian Schools. Many years after this, when the Western House of Refuge moved out of the city into the country, two distinct chapels were erected on its grounds, one for Protestants, and the other for Catholics with a resident chaplain attached. The justice of such an arrangement meanwhile had become more and more recognized. Ten years after the election of the first Catholic chaplain to the Western House of Refuge, Bishop McQuaid was able to write Bishop Gilmour, January 11, 1885: "Our new Governor, successor to Cleveland, came out in his message for Freedom of Religious Worship, clearly, broadly, and boldly. Both parties are bidding for the honor of presenting the Bill. While the game is in hand and sure, what are the shortsighted New Yorkers doing, but spoiling the bill by putting in it that no minister shall be paid. If these stupid men would also arrange a plan by which ministers could live without cost, they would show some sense. However, we shall be able to strike out this clause."[169] Despite new fears the measure finally passed in a satisfactory form, and was duly signed by the Governor, David B. Hill. Thus freedom of religious worship became guaranteed by law to all inmates of penal and public eleemosynary institutions within the State of New York.

Nevertheless, Bishop McQuaid was not completely satisfied in the last decade of his life with all that had been done, as there were still two great public institutions within his diocese without resident chaplains that ought to have had them. One of these was the Craig Colony for Epileptics at Sonyea, Livingston County, N. Y., where the State of New York had acquired possession of nearly 2,000 acres of land, and built a home for the judicious and scientific treatment of the indigent epileptics of the State. At first there were only visiting clergymen officiating at the Colony, but January 9, 1900, the Board of Managers resolved: "That it is the sense of this meeting that there should be two permanent

[168] *Ibid.*, March 17, 1875.

[169] Cleveland Diocesan Archives, No. 4, No. A. *Bishops from 1872 to 1888.*

Chaplains for the Colony, one Protestant and one Catholic."[170] This opened the way for Bishop McQuaid, who informed Archbishop Corrigan of his plans in regard to the institution, April 17, 1900.

> The present Chapel is a large room to be used by both [Catholics and non-Catholics], and also for general purposes of assembly. I proposed to build a Chapel and residence for the use of Catholics alone. . . . In this Chapel there can be many religious services and devotions, the Stations of the Cross and reservation of the Blessed Sacrament.
>
> I intend that Rochester Diocese shall bear one-half of the cost, and I think that the other dioceses of the State might meet the other half. With your consent I will place among some of the pastors of New York collection cards with 20 squares, each square representing 25 cents, the whole card $5. Many pastors will take no interest in the good work; others will gladly help. The whole cost will be about $8,000.
>
> All I ask of my brother bishops is their permission to make this appeal to their people through their pastors.
>
> A point of view deserving of consideration is the introduction of this arrangement into a State Institution. It may in time lead to similar arrangements in other places.[171]

The last point was in fact duly appreciated by the Board of Managers at the Colony. In their meeting, July 10, 1900, they seized the occasion to frame the following resolution of acceptance and thanks.

> Whereas, By virtue of the large and daily increasing number of patients at Craig Colony and its present meagre facilities in the way of a house in which religious service may be observed, and
>
> Whereas, A large percentage of all the patients at the colony are of one religious faith—the Catholic—and
>
> Whereas, The Right Reverend B. J. McQuaid, Bishop of Rochester, N. Y., has offered to donate funds to construct a Catholic chapel, in conjunction with a cottage for a priest, on the colony, free of all expense to the State, giving the managers of the colony the right to approve the plans and location of the buildings,
>
> *Resolved*, That we, the Board of Managers of Craig Colony, do hereby accept the magnanimous offer of the Bishop of Rochester, and extend to him our thanks.
>
> We feel that the Bishop of Rochester, in building a chapel of this kind, is engaging in pioneer work that will have widespread influence.[172]

The work made due progress, and on February 18, 1902, Bishop McQuaid "visited the Craig Colony for Epileptics to inspect the chapel and the chaplain's residence. I was much pleased with both, but the dedication of the chapel is postponed until April 8, by which time the stained-glass windows and Stations will be in place."[173] With this important work practically

---

[170] Minutes of Board of Managers. Kindness of Dr. Wm. T. Shanahan, Medical Superintendent, through Rev. Walter McCarthy.

[171] M. A. C. New York Archdiocesan Archives, Vol. 15, Archbishop's House.

[172] Minutes of the Board of Managers.

[173] Bishop McQuaid to Archbishop Corrigan. New York Diocesan Archives, Vol. 35. Archbishop House.

finished, he turned his attention to the other State Institution, for which he proposed to do almost as much, as he informed Archbishop Corrigan, February 19, 1902:

> I am now preparing to build a chaplain's house and small chapel attached for week day's Mass, reservation of the B. S., at the State Soldiers' Home at Bath, Steuben Co. This will only cost about $3,500 and no appeal will be made outside of the Diocese of Rochester. The Chaplain can use the chapel on the grounds for Sundays. The Chapel connected with his house will not hold more than fifty. There are about 600 or 700 soldiers in the Home. The trustees are not unwilling to build the house, but I preferred to build it myself, as thus I would have a good hold in the place.[174]

Bishop McQuaid's plans were also duly carried out at the Soldiers' Home. Thus Catholic ministration was brought into two State Institutions in a way to benefit the inmates, who needed even more than others the ever present consolation of their Holy Religion.

FREDERICK J. ZWIERLEIN, D. SC., M. H.,
St. Bernard's Seminary,
Rochester, N. Y.

---

[174] *Ibid.*

EUSEBIO KINO

1644-1711

Gilmary Shea regrets that the life of Kino, whom he regards as one of the greatest of American missionaries, has never been written. Alegre voices the same sentiment, but in his *Compañia de Jesús en Nueva Espana* he gives sufficient data to enable us to appreciate, at least to some extent, the greatness of this remarkable man.

Hubert Bancroft (xv, p. 250) informs us that "Eusebius Kühn, *as his name was doubtless written in his earliest years* (Kino being a Spanish compromise between the original Kühn and *Quino*), was born in the Austrian Tyrol." The *Journal de Trévoux*, a Jesuit publication of the eighteenth century, also assumes that Kino was a German. Gilmary Shea calls him Kühn. Gleeson, in his *History of the Church in California* (p. 85), gives us a variation by adding an *o* to the German appellative, and hence the great man appears as Kuhno; but that may have been a slip, just as later on, in the same volume, we find the illustrious Kircher transformed into Kirker.

Fr. Huonder, S.J., pronounces for Kühn and says that "Kino represents its Spanish and Italian form." Unfortunately for this assertion it is not true either for Italian or Spanish. Thus the first Italian dictionary at hand has the following piece of information under the letter *K: Lettera detta Kappa non è necessaria agl'Italiani, e viene solo adoperata in qualche nome straniero.* It is the same for Spanish. *K* does not appear in the list of consonants and just as in Italian, we are told by a Spanish lexicographer: "It is used only in words taken from other languages, many of which, however, are now spelled with *c* or *q*." In the dictionary before us there are just sixteen words beginning with *K*, and one of them is "Kyrieleison."

Sommervogel, on the other hand, in his *Bibliotheca Scriptorum S.J.*, insists that the name was originally *Chino*, and he substantiates his assertion by the testimony of a descendant of the family. Besides, since he was born near Trent, the language of the family must have been Italian. Indeed, Huonder tells us that "Kino was born in the *Welschtirol*." But under the title

Wales in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, we read that the name "Wales" was given to that country not by its inhabitants but by the *Teutonic* occupiers of England, and meant "the territory of the *alien* race." "Thus *Welch* (German, *Walsch*) implies a people of either Latin or Celtic origin living in a land near or adjoining Teutonic territory. Thus "Walschland" is a poetical expression in German for "Italy."

The Italian character of the Chino family might also be shown by the fact that the famous Italian missionary in China, Martino Martini, was Chino's cousin. Like Chino, he was a distinguished geographer.

Better than all this, we have Chino's own signature. On one of his autograph maps appears the inscription: *Tabula Californiae ex autoptica observatione delineata a R. P. Eusebio Chino S. J.* This ought to be final, and Huonder refers to this map as appearing in the *Neuer Welt-Bott*. That publication, however, is credited with taking another liberty with the name. Chino appears as *Chinoe*.

Why, it may be asked, if the name were originally "Chino," was it changed to Kino? For a very simple reason. In Italian, the pronunciation of *ch* before *i* is hard, as *chiesa*, *chiaro*, etc.; whereas in Spanish the sound of *ch* is soft before all the vowels, *muchacho*, *chiquito*, etc. When, therefore, this "Italian," as Alegre calls him, found himself among his Spanish brethren he was forced to spell his name with a *K* so to preserve his patronymic, and also to prevent himself from being regarded as a Chinaman. Padre Chino would have been a very awkward designation in Mexico.

This conclusion had been arrived at, in an article on "Kino" written for *The Catholic Historical Review* and it was already in print when the forthcoming publication of Bolton's very remarkable *Historical Memoir of Father Kino*, was announced.[1] The article in question was, of course, promptly recalled, until Dr. Bolton's book could be consulted; and it is very satisfactory to be able to record that the *Memoir* puts the question of Kino's race

[1] HERBERT E. BOLTON, PH.D., *Kino's Historical Memoir of Primeria Alta. A contemporary account of the beginnings of California, Sonora, and Arizona, by Father Eusebio Francisco Kino, S.J., Pioneer Missionary, Explorer, Cartographer, and Ranchman* 1683-1711, 2 vols. Cleveland (Arthur H. Clark Company), 1919.

beyond question. Indeed, on the list of Jesuits who embarked for Mexico on July 12, 1678, appears the name: Eusebius Franciscus *Chinus*, not Kino nor Kühn.

It is difficult to overrate the value of this very notable contribution to the knowledge of the conditions of Northern Mexico at the end of the 17th century. The title of the book is "Celestial Favors" which would naturally suggest a treatise on ascetism, whereas the "Celestial Favors" are nothing but the heaven-sent opportunities given to Spain for the conversion of the Pimería Indians. The original of the manuscript was discovered by Dr. Bolton eleven years ago, after a century and a half of oblivion. He came upon it, he tells us, in the Archivo General y Publico at Mexico City. It is admirably translated; a task, says the distinguished editor "which is lightly regarded only by those who have never tried it." With this judgment all who have tried it will heartily concur. No library of any consequence can afford to be without these two handsome volumes.

Eusebio Chino entered the Society of Jesus in Bavaria, November 20, 1665. He was then twenty-one years of age. He subsequently taught mathematics at Ingolstadt, and while occupying that post, he applied for the foreign missions. He left the University in 1678, but did not reach Mexico until late in 1681. The reason of the delay was his assignment as an observer of the famous comet of 1680 and 1681. During that time, he lived in Cadiz, but did not publish the result of his observations until after he arrived in Mexico. The book has a very portentous title and is quoted in Sommervogel as: *Exposicion Astronomica de el Cometa, que el año de* 1680, *por los meses de Noviembre y Diziembre, y este año de* 1681 *por los meses de Enero y Febrero, se ha visto en todo el mondo, y le ha observado en Ciudad de Cadiz el P. Eusebio Francisco Kino, de la Compañia de Jesus, con licencia en Mexico por Francisco Rodriguez Lupercio,* 1681.

Possibly this pompous announcement was intended as an apology for Kino's audacity in questioning the findings of a famous astronomer of the period who rejoiced in the name *Don Carlos de Siguenza y Gongora, Cosmographo y Mathematico Regio en la Academia Mexicana.*

The settlement of Lower California had been attempted as early as 1535 by a Franciscan who landed with Cortes, at Santa

Cruz Bay near the present La Paz. "After a year of privations," says Englehardt, "which had cost the famous conqueror $300,000, the project had to be abandoned. Another effort was made in 1596, but the mission did not last a single year. Almost a century later, namely in 1683, the Jesuit Fathers Kino and Goni, along with Fray José Guijosa of the Order of St. John of God, accompanied Admiral Otondo on an expedition to that unhappy country."

They embarked on the *Limpia Concepcion* and the *San José y San Francisco Javier* and set sail on January 18. A sloop with provisions was to accompany them, but it never left port. The voyage lasted until March 30, and on that day they entered the harbor of La Paz, but not until April 5 did the Admiral set foot on shore to take solemn possession of the land. The official document which he sent to the King announcing this important event is worth quoting as an example of the style of the State Papers of those days. It runs as follows:

> In the Port which is called La Paz, in the region of California, on the fifth day of April in the year 1683. Señor Almirante Isidro de Ontondo y Antillon, Supreme Head of the Royal Armada [it may be noted that this particular Armada consisted of two ships] anchoring in this Port and taking possession of this region for His Majesty, declared as follows:
>
> It did please God that, on Thursday, the first of the said month we should find bottom in this port for the ship named the *Immaculate Conception*, and the Admiral's ship *St. Joseph and St. Francis Xavier*, after having left the Port of Chacala on the 17 of last January of the present year, having been delayed in that short passage by contrary winds and currents, but on April 2, thanks be to God, all the company, including the Reverend Father Eusebio Francisco Kino and Pedro Matias Gogni *de la Sagrada Compañia de Jesus* and also Friar José Guijosa, Professed Religious of St. John of God, as well as the two Captains *de mar y guerra*, Don Francisco de Ponda y Atco and Don Blas de Guzman y Cordova, with the Ensign Martin de Verastegui and 24 soldiers, who with arms in hand leaped ashore and gave thanks to God. A little fresh water was found, for which, by order of the Admiral, a well was dug deep and wide so that all might have enough to quench their thirst. Then one of the 200 palm trees in the grove nearby was cut down and planted on an eminence, about an arquebus-shot from the shore so as to proclaim abroad that the land thus taken was habitable. And in virtue of the faculty granted by the Apostolic See to the Catholic monarch to annex to the royal crown and to conquer and acquire the barbarous countries of the West in America, and to take possession of them through his vassals . . . the Admiral

after having made the infantry ready did come ashore with all the people hereinbefore mentioned, namely, all the infantry and the Ensign Martin de Verastegui, who did take in his hand a scarlet standard on one side of which was the image of Our Lady of Help and on the other, the arms of His Majesty, whom may God preserve; and the said Captains and all the infantry under arms and the said Ensign with his standard, did at a signal given by the said Admiral discharge their muskets, the said Ensign did three times wave the standard and all did acclaim and repeat:

Long live Charles II, monarch of the Spains, our King and natural Lord, in whose royal name, the said Admiral did take possession of this region which he entitled and named the Province of the Most Holy Trinity of the Californias, so that God's infinite power may assist in winning the said Provinces to the Holy Catholic Faith. And as a sign of all hereinbefore set down, the Señor Admiral had the said standard placed under the shade of a palm tree and there planted his camp, naming it Our Lady of Peace. And to testify to your Majesty and to His Excellency the Viceroy, in the name of the King, and in pursuance of our obligations to render an account of the manner and care employed in this, the said Province, he did command the Notary who was present to take down in writing and to add the testimony of all the persons above mentioned, which order has been carried out.

To the document is added:

I the aforesaid Notary attest and certify that all has transpired as has been related above, and as a perpetual memorial of the same are here attached the signatures of the said Señor Admiral with the said Reverend Fathers, Captains, and others which have been here subscribed, in the Port of LaPaz on the 5th day of April, 1683.

Don Isidro de Otondo y Antillon, Eusebio Francisco Kino, and Pedro Matias Gogni of the Compania de Jesus; Friar Joseph Guijosa of St. John of God: Martin Verastegui; Don Francisco Pareda y Arce; Don Blas Guzman y Cordova; and Don Lorenzo Fernandez Lascono.

Before me

DIEGO DE SALES,
Royal Secretary.

In this pompous fashion Father Eusebio Kino was introduced into mission history, and in the language of the day was the "cosmografo" whose mathematical training would enable him to map out both the ports they entered and those they passed by.

In spite, however, of this robustious proclamation, Ontondo does not seem to have made a very valuable gift to the Majesty of the Spains. A hole dug in the ground into which some water dribbled could scarcely suffice for the comfort of the colonists, and was quite inadequate to raise live stock and cultivate the

soil. Nor could he hope for supplies from the other side of the Gulf if other voyages were to be as slow as his own. Over and above this, not a single native had so far made his appearance, and it was only when the tents were pitched that some of them were sighted in the distance. They were evidently not overjoyed at the arrival of the Spaniards, and it was only after the priests had offered them something to eat that they came near. The Admiral, however, was so convinced that they were friendly that he started out to explore the country. On the southeast he found the Guaicuros, "who," says Alegre somewhat naively, "did not tell him they were much obliged to him for his visit. Indeed they concealed their children, refused to give even a drink of water to the soldiers and then frightened the valiant Admiral out of his wits. A band of warriors suddenly appeared and then scampered off to see how many Spaniards were left in the Presidio. However, no attack was made."

The Coros also were found in that direction. They were a peaceable set and proved their friendship, later on, when the Guaicoros asked them to join in an attempt to murder the newcomers. The proposal was apparently accepted, but the Coros informed the Admiral of the plot, so that the Spaniards were prepared, when, on July 1, fifteen or twenty poor Indians attempted to capture the post. A swivel-gun was planted where the unfortunate wretches had to pass, and before they even suspected any danger a number of dead and wounded lay stretched on the ground.

In spite of this easy victory, however, the Spaniards themselves were more frightened than the Indians, and called upon the Admiral to abandon the post which he had so solemnly taken possession of two months before. The cruel historian says that "they whimpered like children and insisted on leaving La Paz even if they had to go to a barren island." The real reason of the panic, however, would appear to have been that their food was giving out or rotting, and the ship which had been despatched for supplies to the other side of the Gulf had not returned.

The Admiral was disgusted and withstood the clamor until the 14th of July. Then he and his faint-hearted followers set sail for the end of the Peninsula and from there crossed over to Sinaloa, where they remained till September; but after awhile,

for some unaccountable reason, or yielding perhaps to the pleadings of Otondo, they plucked up courage and on October 6, after an eight days' sail, returned to California. It was St. Bruno's Day when they reached land, and hence they gave his name to the new place.

St. Bruno's exact location cannot at present be indicated, for it has disappeared from the modern maps. At all events it was a more satisfactory place than La Paz, for a ship sent to the Yaqui River on November 16 was back again on the 20th, with an abundance of provisions and live stock. The trip had been made in thirty hours, and, best of all, the Indians had been coming every day to the post and were as much at home as if they were Spaniards. Of course the missionaries were delighted and immediately began to study the native language. They soon found two distinct forms of speech and classified them as Edues and Didios. The words of the new tongue were easy to pronounce, though they lacked the letters *f* and *s*. On the other hand, the Indians did not appear to have much trouble in picking up Spanish.

Some of the devices employed to get religious ideas into the heads of the neophytes afforded no little amusement. Thus, on November 9, when the chapel was finished, a beautiful picture of Christ crucified was placed over the altar. The Indians were very much frightened by it. They did not even dare to look at it or speak about it, at least to the white man, but they asked each other: "Who is it? Is it one of their captives whom they killed in war? What a cruel people they are to treat a man in that way!" Finally, the Fathers contrived in one way or another to let them know what it meant.

There was considerable trouble also in explaining the resurrection of the dead, and the following scheme was resorted to. With great ceremony a number of flies were put under a heap of ashes and then exposed to the sun. After awhile, of course, the flies began to work their way out and escaped. The delighted Indians exclaimed again and again: *Ibimuheite, Ibimuheite,* and ever afterward that word was used to mean "resurrection."

On the 1st and 21st of December other exploring parties were sent out to the west and south, and although the arrival of the white men at first emptied those rancherias of their inhabitants,

a little coaxing by the priests and others soon induced the fugitives to return and, later on, to present themselves at the post.

The two missionaries made daily visits to the various villages of the Edues and Didios, and they found the people gentle and docile, and occasionally some Indians from other parts of the country were met with. Of course the maize and hats and strips of cloth and rings and bracelets were powerful attractions for the unclothed and hungry savages, and His Majesty's liberality in that respect was boundless, but always on condition that they would listen to the Padres. The Didios were especially quick at learning the *doctrina* and recited their lesson in unison every day in the chapel. There would have been many baptisms, but the stability of the neophytes was still a matter of doubt.

Meantime the soldiers and officials of the expedition began to show signs of discontent. They had not left Mexico to convert these naked Indians. What they wanted was to get near the pearl fisheries and the gold mines. Meantime, the expenditures of the Government on the enterprise were enormous and evidently out of all proportion with the returns. Nor was there any hope of improvement in the future. The fresh water pools were few and far between and often muddy and foul; the soil was arid, the climate unhealthy and oppressively hot, and, unlike the first run to the Yaqui for supplies, the trips were now irregular and slow. Even the gentle savages began to cause alarm. Thus in February the Edues had stampeded in a rage, dragging their women and children from the Presidio because someone had been whipped, and as they fled they vowed that they would return and burn the post, for they would have nothing more to do with the proud and ungrateful people whose houses they had helped to build, whose flocks they had tended, and whose ships they had labored to unload.

For a time the Spaniards were alarmed, especially when they heard that the Indians were talking of killing Otondo and driving the others from the country with the exception of the two Fathers who had done them no harm. Indeed during all the trouble the missionaries went around to the different rancherias and, by expostulating and entreating and giving them presents from the Admiral, succeeded in tranquillizing them to a certain degree. But it was not altogether successful, for later on the Didios

murdered a shepherd and, when pursued, successfully eluded the soldiers.

The general result was that the men were habitually surly, and their bad temper was aggravated by the long absence of the Admiral, by the shortage of food, and the outbreak of an epidemic. But when Otondo returned with a reenforcement of twenty soldiers and another missionary named Copart, besides flour, rice and eleven months' pay, their spirits revived. Everyone was happy now, especially Father Kino, who was to make his vows of profession in the hands of Copart. This was on August 15, but on the 29th he was ordered back to Mexico. He took with him a Didios Indian, as well as a map of all that section of Lower California which he had been able to explore. The mission lasted only a short time after his departure, for although the two Fathers whom he left behind him, and doubtless also the Friar, were willing to remain, the garrison and the officials insisted upon abandoning the place. This was Spain's third failure in establishing a post in Lower California. Father Copart is said to have been so depressed by the abandonment of the mission that he lost his mind.

When Kino reached Mexico he was made a member of a *junta* in which he was associated with the Fiscal of the Royal Audiencia and Admiral Otondo to study the California colonization question and to report to the Viceroy. At one time the Government made an offer to the Jesuits to undertake both the religious and military responsibility of another attempt at settlement, and the Treasury was to furnish the requisite funds to the extent of 30,000 pesos a year, but of course the offer was rejected as the civil and military control made the proposition incompatible with the plans of a Religious Order. They were quite willing to supply all the missionaries who might be needed, but they refused to be government officials.

Then a certain "Capitan" de Luzernilla proposed to undertake the work at half the proffered rate but as he had failed on a former occasion his offer was rejected and the whole affair was handed over to the Admiral. As money, however, was scarce the scheme was dropped for the time being.

California was now a closed country and Kino applied for a mission among the Pima Indians. He did not, however, intend

to remain there permanently, for his heart was in California. His offer was welcomed by the Provincial, who would have sent him immediately thither, but a government permission was a prerequisite, as well as a royal assignment of funds. Neither difficulty dismayed Kino, and he immediately interviewed the Viceroy and was so eloquent in his plea that he not only received permission and financial aid to work in the new field but authorization for whatever post he might choose among the Seris of Sonora.

When that much was accomplished, he set off for Guadalajara, where the Royal Audiencia was in session, to address them on another matter which was very close to his heart, namely, the abrogation of the stupid policy of imposing labor on the convert Indians in the mines and haciendas, while the others who refused to be Christians were allowed to go scot free. It was putting a premium on paganism.

All that he could get, however, from the Audiencia was a five-year exemption, in spite of the fact that as far back as 1607 Philip III had ruled that for ten years after baptism every convert should be exempt from compulsory labor. The same royal order had been renewed in 1618, and it was most faithfully observed where there were no mines or haciendas to put the converts at work.

Indeed in the very year that the missionary was making his appeal, Charles II had extended the exemption to twenty years, and Alegre asks if Kino was aware of such an edict. No doubt he was, just as he was aware of its non-observance. He had got at least a five-year exemption from the local official, and that was better for all practical purposes than the royal command, which was never obeyed. No doubt he hoped for something better later on. With this warrant in his hand he set out for Pimería.

What was the Pimería? It was the land of the Pima Indians. In 1764, it was the northern limit of Spain's possessions, about 400 leagues from the city of Mexico and about 130 from Sinaloa. On the east a mountain range separated it from Taurumara, and on the west, the Gulf of California bathed its shores from the Yaqui River to the Colorado. Its northern boundary was the Hila or Gila or Xila River and its southern, the Yaqui. According to Baron La Hontan, the Colorado and Gila have their source in the Great Lakes, a piece of information which is characteristic of La Hontan.

According to Alegre "the soil is rich, there is no end of game, such as lions, tigers, bears, deer, boars, rabbits and squirrels. The woods are full of serpents, poisonous or otherwise, but there are herbs and plants innumerable, which possessed most wonderful healing powers. The birds were numerous and "two-headed eagles," the reader is assured, "were not rare." Kino, as far as we can find, makes no mention of "two headed eagles."

The people were robust and lived to an extreme old age, except where the fogs of the lowland prevailed. There all sorts of ailments occur. The Pimas were composed of a number of tribes such as the Opas, Cocomaricopas, Hudcoacanes, Yumas, etc. They lived on both sides of the Gila River in rancherias, which the missionaries united into pueblos. They numbered in all about 30,000. The Serios who were found along the Gulf coast were mostly identified with the Giuamas. To the north were the savage Apaches.

None of these people had any means of recording the doings of the past, such as the hieroglyphics of the Mexicans, but they made much of certain traditions which they refused to impart to strangers. As far as could be ascertained, they had no sacrifice or idols, no kind of worship and no priests except the wizards, whom they regarded with abject terror.

Tatooing around the eyes was universal, even for children. At birth a sort of sponsor for the child was summoned, and he was given more authority than the parent. At death all the trappings and household belongings of the departed were buried with him. They believed in divinations like the ancient Greeks and Romans, with the difference that the creature inspected was not a bird but a lobster. Statues and emblems were placed on the roadsides, before which every passer-by had to leave an offering. Alegre gives a long list of their superstitions, some of which Bancroft denounces as hideously obscene. The initiation of the warrior resembled the horrible ritual common among the northern Mandans, and the torture of captives, even of little children, by old squaws, was as fiendish as similar practices among the Iroquois.

The Jesuit missions among these people were inaugurated as early as 1637 or 1638, by Father Castano, who had been trained in the Sonora district by Mendez, but the Pima section to which

Kino betook himself was a new field. He called his first post N. S. de los Dolores, and it may be found on the map just north of Cucurpe at the source of the river called Horcasitas or San Miguel. From there he developed dependent stations, and before 1691, he had three at San Ignacio, Remedios, and San José in each of which he built a fine church.

In 1691 Father Salvatierra went to the Pima district as the official Visitor and at Dolores met Kino, whom he found to be a man after his own heart. They traveled north together by Hymeris, Caborca, Tubutama and other missions founded a short time before. Their destination was Cocospera, but when some caciques of the Sabaypioris, who lived 160 leagues higher up, came to ask for missionaries, the request was granted and the priests accompanied the petitioners to their rancherias of Guevavi, where they were cordially received by all the tribe. Some children were baptized and, when arrangements were made for Kino to return to visit them and assume full care of the mission till someone was found in Mexico to take his place, the two friends continued on the journey At Cocospera they separated, Salvatierra to visit the other posts and Kino to go down to Mexico to get missionaries.

Salvatierra must have been delighted with what he saw, for Bolton tells us: "The work which Father Kino did as a ranchman or stockman would alone stamp him as an unusual business man and make him worthy of remembrance. He was easily the cattle king of his day and region. The stock raising industry of nearly 20 places on the modern map owes its beginnings to this indefatigable man. And it must not be supposed that he did this for private gain for he did not own a single animal. It was to furnish a food supply for the Indians of the missions established and to be established and to give these missions a basis of economic prosperity and independence. Thus we find Saeta thanking him for the gift of 115 head of cattle, and as many sheep to begin a ranch at Caborca. In 1700, when San Xavier was founded Kino rounded up 1400 head of cattle on the ranch of his own mission at Dolores, and dividing them into two droves, sent one of them under his Indian overseer, to San Xavier. In the same year he took 700 cattle from his own ranch, and sent them to

Salvatierra, across the Gulf at Loreto—a transaction which was several times repeated."

During that long journey in Northern Mexico, Kino had often spoken to Salvatierra about the failure of the attempt to evangelize Lower California, to which his heart still clung, and he suggested to his companion that in his capacity of official Visitor he might make another effort to redeem the unfortunate people who lived there. It was true, he admitted, that the country was so barren that it could not be self-sustaining, but he was convinced that it would be an easy matter to convey provisions from fertile Pimería to the starving Californians if a ship could be constructed to transport to the other side of the Gulf whatever the future missionaries and people might need.

Salvatierra took fire at the idea, and, before they parted, ordered Kino to build the barque at any point he might select along the west coast of Mexico and assured him that he himself would further the project with all the power at his disposal. Salvatierra became later on the apostle of Lower California. He had found his vocation up in the forests of the Pimería. It was Kino who made him a great apostle.

It was not until 1694 that Kino attempted to build the ship. He was then among the Sobas on the Gulf, and with him were Father Campo and Captain Manje, the latter of whom has left a diary of that journey.

> On February 14, *he writes*, we climbed Mt. Nazareno, and from there we saw the waters of the Gulf and, on the other shore, four mountains which we called the Four Evangelists, and also a small island to the Northwest, with the three peaks of The Three Marys, while to the Southeast, we saw the island of the Seris which we called St. Augustin the Tiburon and others. On the 15th, we journeyed 12 leagues further and found ourselves on the shore, at a place which never since Sonora was settled sixty years ago had been reached by any white man. We saw more clearly than on the preceding day the mountains on the other side of the Gulf, whose width here we found out by our instruments to be about twenty leagues. We were then in 32° lat. On that day there were twenty-five baptisms of children and sick people, and there was every hope of bringing all the people of this great district into the bosom of the Church.

There Kino saw his chance to build his boat. For that purpose, he returned to the same place in March 16, with the

captain and twenty workmen and all the axes and saws he could gather, but he was the only carpenter and builder in the crowd and he had first to instruct his followers how to use their tools.

On March 21, after celebrating Mass, he selected a tall poplar, 38 feet high, for the keel. Then, while the lumber was being felled, he hurried around among the recently discovered rancherias, remaining there till June. Meantime, at his request, the captain had started north, on a tour of discovery and on his return announced a most joyful bit of news. He had found the Gila River and the wonderful buildings on its banks. He had also visited the warlike tribes of that district, the Opas, the Cocomancopas and others who thus far had never been heard of.

Of course Coronado had been in those parts 150 years before, but the romantic stories that had been purposely spread abroad about his discoveries had been long dismissed as fiction or had been completely forgotten. Hence, Manje had substantially made a new discovery.

It was a very important as well as a very consoling find for an ardent apostle like Kino, but just as he had finished the hardest part of his shipbuilding an order came from Father Visitor Juan Munoz de Burgos to drop all work on his ship. He obeyed blindly, although he had been commissioned to begin the work by the Visitor, Salvatierra, and knew as no one else could, the great service the boat would render even to the Mexico missions. Nevertheless, he quietly returned to his post at Dolores.

Kino's account of this suspension of his ship-building labors differs from that of Alegre, for in Bolton's Vol. II, page 242 we read: "I suspended the building of the vessel since I discovered that in latitude 34½°, the Sea of California ended completely."

As if nothing had happened, he continued his apostolic work, and when the opportunity presented itself he journeyed to the Gila which Manje had told him about. Alegre, with Kino's papers in hand, describes in detail the famous structures along the river. Kino is said to have celebrated Mass in the largest of those ruined buildings, the famous Casa Grande. It was quadrilateral in form and four stories high. The rafters were of cedar and the walls of solid cement and masonry. It was divided into various compartments, some of them spacious enough for a considerable assembly. The tradition among the people was

that Montezuma's predecessors built it on the way from the north to the southern countries where they ultimately settled. At a distance of three leagues from this Casa and on the other side of the river are the ruins of another edifice, which appears to have been still more sumptuous. Indeed the ruins at that place would indicate that at one time there had been not merely a palace but a whole city, and the natives assured the missionaries that there were other buildings further north which were marvelous for their symmetry and arrangements. Among them was a labyrinth which appears to have been a pleasure house of some great king. Excavators have discovered in various places, sometimes leagues away from these great buildings, shapely and variously colored slabs, and two leagues from the Casa Grande there was found the basin of a reservoir large enough to supply a populous city and to irrigate the fertile plains around for great distances; while to the west was a lagoon which was emptied by a narrow sluice. The regularity of the circular form of this lagoon and its rather contracted dimensions would suggest that it was the work of men were it not for its extraordinary depth. Holes had been cut into the solid rock which subsequently were found large enough to be used as storehouses for provisions for troops.

These ruins, however, do not appear to have interested Kino to any great extent. There were other ruins that worried him about that time. His own missions seemed to be facing universal destruction. He himself was being denounced in Mexico as conveying false information to the government about his Indians, who were accused of being in secret alliance with the Apaches, who were destroying the country and defying the Spaniards. Kino again and again had denied the truth of these charges, but he was not only not believed but was held up as a deliberate liar.

On March 29, 1695, the Pimas of Tubutama had as a matter of fact burned the priest's house and church, profaned the sacred vessels and then, starting down the river to Caborca, had, after murdering Father Saeta and desecrating the church, killed four servants of the mission. An armed force was quickly sent after them and succeeded in killing a certain number in the battle that ensued. Fifty of them then gave themselves up on a promise of

immunity, but on arriving in camp they were brutally murdered. The troops then hastened to Cocospera, fancying that they had restored peace, but they were no sooner out of sight than the Pimas laid waste to the whole Tubutama Valley and destroyed every town on the San Ignacio River.

Where was Kino all this time? Quietly waiting to be killed at Dolores. He had concealed the sacred vessels in a cave and was kneeling in prayer, expecting the tomahawk or a poisoned arrow. But no one came. He was too much beloved by all the Indians to be injured in the least, even in their wildest excess of fury.

Of course the Spaniards ultimately won. They ravaged the whole country and slaughtered the savages until the entire tribe was terror-stricken and forced by hunger or fear of annihilation to sue for peace. Through the influence of the missionaries, a general pardon was granted, and then the work of reconciling the red men to the terrible whites had to be begun all over again.

In spite of appearances to the contrary, however, the Indians were not the real culprits. Kino went down to Mexico in 1695, and remained there till 1696, fighting fiercely to show that the guilt of the massacre should be laid at the door of the Spaniards themselves. Thus at Tutubama, where the uprising started, the superintendent was a monster of cruelty, using the lash for the most trifling offenses. His subaltern was still more heartless. Thus, happening to find some meat in a rancheria, he immediately put three Indians to death for cattle-stealing and flogged anyone he could lay hold of. After all this had been done, it was discovered that the meat which had been seized was not beef at all, but venison, and consequently that there had been no cattle-lifting.

Kino brought all this out, and he likewise vindicated his people from the charge of being in secret league with the terrible Apaches. In 1697 he went with Captain Manje and a troop of soldiers to report on the conditions prevailing after the massacre and, quite unexpectedly and by the merest accident, came upon a party of Pimas who were celebrating a war dance around thirteen Apache scalps. No more was needed to show the sentiments of the Pimas with regard to the Apaches.

Of course, when he returned to Dolores, he was received with the utmost enthusiasm by his people. Not only the Pimas but

the Sobas and Sobaipuris came out to welcome him. They loaded him with gifts and made all sorts of promises of future good behavior, and he then set himself to the task of rebuilding the devastated rancherias.

Notwithstanding this return, however, to normal conditions and the great increase of his influence over the Indians, Kino still longed to devote himself to the regeneration of the degraded Californians, and he asked to be associated with Salvatierra, who had gone thither in 1697, but owing to the protest of the Pimas the Mexican Government positively refused to permit him to leave the district where his presence was so essential for peace.

Of course he submitted, just as he had done several years before when ordered by his superior to abandon his shipbuilding project, nevertheless he still heard the cry in his soul for California, and as he had been twice thwarted he determined to make an effort in another direction by an overland route.

The prevailing impression in Mexico at the time was that the barren tract on the other side of the Gulf was an island. The original explorers had set it down on their maps as a peninsula, but Francis Drake's narrative had upset that view, and it was commonly held to be an island, although Oñate's account had thrown some doubt on Drake's conclusion. Kino determined to settle that point, and he therefore began a series of journeys from Dolores which have placed him in the forefront of American explorers, not only because of the immense territory he visited and mapped out but because of the very important acquisition to geographical knowledge which resulted from his unwearied, persistent and painstaking investigations.

For him, however, the advancement of scientific knowledge was only a secondary consideration. His primary purpose was to carry out the plan which he and Salvatierra had formulated some years before of establishing a line of posts from Northern Mexico down to the end of Lower California—a plan worthy of these two great spiritual conquerors. If science were going to profit by it, so much the better. Such was the absorbing, heroic purpose of the last years of Kino's life.

In November, 1697, he and Captain Manje, after making the circuit of all the Pima reservations, directed their steps to the Gila Valley, and, besides reporting to the Government on the

condition of the tribes, paid a special visit to the Casa Grande, of which they have left an accurate and detailed description. They returned to Dolores on December 2, after a journey of 260 miles in the wilderness.

In 1698, after recovering from a severe illness, Kino again started north with Diego Carasco and some Indian guides. He arrived at San Andrea where, after sending some couriers to the Opatas and Comaricopas, whose whereabouts is indicated on Kino's map of 1701 (Bancroft, xv, p. 279), he turned west, intending, as he himself states in his writings, to climb a mountain there in order to see the surrounding country and, if possible, the waters of the Gulf. On October 1, a violent fever made him retrace his steps, but at San Andrea he was consoled by meeting a great number of Cocomaricopas, who had started out to welcome him even before his couriers had arrived in their country. These Indians resembled the Pimas in their customs, but especially in their mildness and docility. They were strong, robust and handsome. They had long known of his affection for the Pimas, and that served to attract them, especially, as for some years back he had been sending his greetings to them. They all wanted to be baptized, but he could do nothing but promise to visit them as soon as possible. Then, after having appointed a governor for them as well as a captain and a fiscal, he sent them home happy

From there he and his party went to San Rafael de Actien, where with his astrolabe he took the altitude of the sun and found it to be 52°, "an observation," says Alegre, "which enables us to correct all the old maps of the Pimería; for given that San Rafael was at elevation 52° and that the observation was in the beginning of October, it will be found that the situation of that place was at 32° 30′ 45″ N. L."

"Arrived at San Mateo," continues Alegre (iii, p. 104), and he is quarreling with the author of the *Afanes* on this point, "Kino climbed the mountain of Santa Brigida and saw quite near to him the Gulf of California with a port or bay which, because it was in latitude about 32½°, must have been what the old cosmographers called the Santa Clara range." In Alegre's text, we find latitude 23½°, which is evidently 33½°. "From its summit, I saw," says Kino himself, "I clearly descried the

beach at the mouth of the Colorado, but as there was a fog on the sea I could not make out the California coast." On another occasion, however, namely in 1694, he and Juan Mates had seen the other side from a point lower down the coast, viz., from Mt. Nazarene de Caborca. A point of identification left by Kino was that the mountain on which he stood in 1698, had been once a volcano. The marks of it were all around him.

Kino could not then pursue his exploration to the mouth of the river. His guides and companions refused to go any further, so he had to turn homeward. On the way back, however, he was consoled by discovering more than "4,000 souls," to use Alegre's expression, "in rancherias which were until then unknown to him. He baptized about 400 babies and sent little presents to his Indian friends along the Colorado and Gila," or, as Kino spells it, "Hila." After making arrangements for future explorations he set out for Dolores, which he reached on October 18 after a journey of 300 leagues,

In 1699, he was joined by his friend Captain Manje, and they resolved to reach the Colorado itself and go down the stream to the mouth. But they failed to find guides, for it was an unfriendly country, and so the disappointed men again returned to Dolores. Kino was seriously ill on his arrival, but was on his feet again in October when the Visitador, Father Leal, wanted to inspect the country. The official got no further than Bac, while Kino and Manje started west, but did not succeed in going far, and were at the mission again in November.

On September 24, 1700, Kino attempted a new route. Striking the Gila east of the bend, he followed its course down to the Yuma country. After settling a quarrel between the Yumas and their neighbors, he climbed a high hill to explore, but saw only land. He then crossed to the north bank of the Gila with some Yumas and journeyed on to their principal rancheria, which he called San Dionisio, because the day of his arrival was the feast of that saint, October 9. There he ascended another mountain and this time was rewarded. The sun was setting as he reached the summit, but he clearly saw the river running 10 leagues west of San Dionisio and, after a course of 20 leagues south, emptying into the Gulf. From another hill to the south he saw before his eyes the sandy stretches of Lower California.

He had at last succeeded, and on his return to his mission post he received a letter of congratulation from the Governor.

The news had evidently reached Salvatierra, who was then in Mexico begging for his starving Indians and thinking seriously of giving up the mission. It was a matter of life or death to find out whether or not California was a peninsula. He found Kino's old friend, Captain Manje, and together with eleven soldiers and some Indians they started north. Of course Kino joined them on the way.

On March 21, they found themselves on the shores of the Gulf in latitude 32°, from which place they clearly saw the mountain on the other side. The line ran from Northwest to Southeast in the form of a bow, but a line of peaks on the Mexican side prevented the explorers from seeing whether or not there was a junction of the two ranges.

To settle the doubt, Salvatierra, Kino and the captain left their men in the care of the adjutant and started north. They succeeded in making about 15 or 20 leagues and another 8 or 10 were necessary to obtain absolute certainty, but one thing or another made them retrace their steps. Salvatierra however, was convinced that he had proved his point and so was Kino, but the captain refused to be convinced.

The two friends bade each other good-bye at St. Marcelo, Kino going east to S. Javier del Bac to visit his Sobaipuris, and Salvatierra to California, not, however, before informing the Provincial and Father General Gonzalez of the discovery.

In pursuance of a promise made to Salvatierra, Kino set out again on November 3, 1701. He was ill and alone—for Manje was off hunting Apaches—and the solitary Spaniard who had volunteered to go with him, deserted, but his Pimas and Mumas were at his side to the number of about 200.

He arrived at San Dionsio and then traveled a whole day down the east bank of the Colorado. On November 21 he asked to be taken across. The Indians complied with his wish, built a small raft and, with the chief and his braves swimming after it and pushing it ahead of them, succeeded in reaching the other bank. The river there was about 200 yards wide and very deep and swift, so that there was no hope of getting a horse across. Hence his journey down the western side of the river did not

extend over nine miles, for his age prevented him from undertaking what he could easily have accomplished in his earlier days. He was consoled, however, by an immense concourse of Coanopas and Giopas who were eager to receive the Faith. They gave him some comfort of a scientific kind also, for they increased his collection of blue shells which had been brought from the west coast of California, which they told him was only ten days away. They also assured him that a single day's journey would bring him to the mouth of the Colorado. But he had no horses and could go no farther on foot. He was sixty-seven years old, and once more he returned to Dolores, which he reached on December 7.

The wonderful old man, however, was not yet satisfied. He would make one more attempt and with Father Gonzales, a new arrival in the missions, he set his face to the west, reaching San Dionisio by the way of Sonoito and from there went down to Santa Isabel. "*From this point,*" says Bancroft (xv, p. 500), "*they were in new territory. Going down the river they reached tide-water on March 5, 1702, and on the 7th, the very mouth of the river. Nothing but land could be seen on the south, west and north. Surely, they thought there can be no estrecho, and California is a part of America.*"

Kino wanted to cross to the other shore, but the horses could not attempt it. No doubt he sighed when he thought of the boat which the Visitador had forbidden him to build, but of course he did not regret having obeyed. His companion, Gonzalez, was sick, so they turned their steps towards Dolores, where he had to sit down and write a letter to his Superiors to assure them that neither he nor Gonzalez had been drowned. He never saw the Gila or Colorado again.

Nevertheless, he still kept on exploring. In 1704, he opened a new route to the Guaymas by way of Nacameri and Populo, and in January and February of 1706 he advanced south and west from Caborca, over land never before explored, until he reached the Gulf shore, where he discovered an island which he named Santa Iñes, and a more distant land which may have been California.

In October and November of that year, we find him with two military men and a Franciscan Friar climbing Santa Clara Moun-

tain and camping there for the night. In the morning Kino took his last look at the Gulf and the river mouth in the hazy distance.

According to Clavigero these journeys totalled about 20,000 miles. It is almost incredible, but Bolton tells us that "Kino's endurance in the saddle was worthy of a seasoned cowboy." Thus when he went to the City of Mexico in 1695, he travelled no less, on that single journey, than 1500 miles; and he did it in 53 days. Two years later, when he reached the Gila on the north, he did seven or eight hundred miles in 30 days. In 1699, on his trip to and from the Gila he made 720 miles in 39 days; in 1700, 1,000 miles in 26 days; and in 1701, 1,100 miles in 35 days. He was then nearly 60 years of age.

Alegre tells us that "of the four last years of Father Kino's life there is no mention in the manuscripts of the time."

> But, *he adds*, it is impossible to conceive either that the calumnies of which he and his Pimas were the object, or the privations to which he had to submit, or the labor he had to assume could have crushed into inaction and depression his dauntless and untiring soul. On the contrary we are persuaded that during those four years the Lord was exercising the heroic patience of his valiant soldier. Very likely his many infirmities, increased by his great and laborious undertakings, as well as by the burden of advancing years, compelled him to put an end to his journeying and to await quietly in his Mission of Dolores the approaching end of his apostolic career.
>
> His devotion to the great Apostle of the Indies to whom he owed his life had prompted him to add the name of Francis to the one he had received at the baptismal font, and to clothe himself as it were with that same zeal and fervor for the conversion of the Gentiles in the Indian missions. With that in view he had refused the honor which the Duke of Bavaria had proposed to confer upon him as the occupant of the Chair of Mathematics in the University of Inglostadt, though he could not escape the glory which his great abilities won for him at the time of the appearance of the comet of 1680 and also in his subsequent controversy with Mexico's most famous mathematician, Don Carlos de Siguenza y Gongora.
>
> Kino was the first who on a large scale and with anything like assurance of stability suggested the organization of the California missions, to which he would have devoted his life had not his Superiors judged that his presence was indispensable in the Pimería—a loss to the Peninsula—which he made up for by inspiring the great Salvatierra to undertake the work and by his labors for the Peninsula during the time that he was building up the Pima missions. His success was, under heaven, due to his zeal, patience and perseverance. Forever persecuted and calumniated not only in his own personal reputation but in that of his neophytes, by

people of the world and even on one occasion by his own associates, he carried forward the work of the Lord for twenty-four years almost alone, compelling justification at every step and proving triumphantly, by the security he enjoyed in the course of his thousands of miles of journeys among them, the loyalty not only of his own Pimas but of the other nations whom he had led to the Faith. He baptized more than 40,000 infidels, and would have baptized ten times more if he could have cherished any hope of providing them with priests to keep them in the Faith. He travelled many thousands of leagues, and visited so many nations, instructed and civilized so many rancherias that, as the author of *Afanes apostolicos* says, all the zealous missionaries who labored in the 50 years after his death could not collectively have traversed a third part of the pueblos, nations and tribes which this apostolic man converted, instructed and trained in Christianity.

All this is only a rough outline [says Alegre], of the exterior occupations of Father Kino, but it would be impossible to portray the exalted virtue which, amid all his overwhelming labors, stimulated his zeal and made him a worthy instrument in the salvation of souls. During all his missionary career two sheepskins were his bed. His covering was a coarse blanket and his pillow a halberd. Such was the couch on which he stretched his weary limbs after his long and painful journey; on it he rested when grievously ill and on it he breathed his last. His companion, Father Campus, stood over him weeping bitterly but loving him all the more for his humility, poverty and mortification. His death was so holy because during his life, he spent the greater part of the night in prayer, and when at home in the chapel at the altar. Velarde his companion for eight years, always saw him enter, but no matter how long he watched could never see him leave it. He not only prayed, but this nocturnal adoration was accompanied by a bloody discipline which on one occasion his Indians happened to see, only to be amazed and terrified. More than a hundred times a day he visited the Blessed Sacrament, imitating in this respect the great Apostle of Ireland, so that his whole life was a continual prayer. He had the gift of tears, not merely when saying Mass, which he never omitted, but while reading the breviary, a duty which he always fulfilled on his knees. The names of Jesus and Mary were continually on his lips, and when any one used injurious words in speaking to him he replied in the sweetest manner and even tenderly embraced the offender. His conversations were always of God, of the Blessed Mother, of the conversion of the Gentiles. His frequent and high fevers were cured by fasting for five or six consecutive days, but, indeed, even outside of those occurrences his fare was meager and coarse, without salt, and with no other condiment but a few insipid herbs which he took, though the doctors protested. The harshness and austerity exercised on himself was converted into sweetness and tenderness for his Indians to whom he gave everything he could get either by begging or by any industry he could employ in their behalf. Finally, he was a per-

fect example of an apostolic missionary. It was commonly said of him: 'To discover new territories and to convert souls is Father Kino's office. It was while saying Mass before a picture of the dying St. Francis Xavier that he felt the first stroke of the illness that ended his life. It seemed as if the great missionary of the East was opening the door of Heaven for his loving disciple, who was one of the greatest missionaries of the West.'

We have overstepped [continues Alegre], the limits of a historical eulogy in what we have said of this great man; but it was because of our grief that nowhere in our Menology, is there any mention of this illustrious hero. The scant notices in the records of California and the *Afanes Apostolicos* are not enough to enable us to appreciate him in any way commensurate with his work.

REV. THOMAS J. CAMPBELL, S.J.,
New York City.

MISCELLANY

THE BEGINNINGS OF IRISH CATHOLIC JOURNALISM IN AMERICA

By Rev. Dr. Paul J. Foik, C.S.C.

The period that ushered in the French Revolution wrought many changes in the condition of Europe, but nowhere, except in France itself, were institutions so modified, and modes of thought so affected, as in the British dominions. England had just passed through one of the severest conflicts of her history—the Seven Years' War. Hardly had her guns ceased their thunders in this contest when her American colonies revolted and carried their struggle for liberty to a successful issue. The mother-country was still bewailing the misfortune which the egregious folly of her misrule had brought about, when the tumultuous chaos of the great Napoleonic wars, like another deluge, spread destruction and desolation upon a world already sickened with a thousand woes. The waves of enmity and discontent rose high and swept across the whole of Europe. No country on the Continent stood unshaken by the blows of that bitter conflict. Far and wide, swift as the cannon's shot, proceeded the cry of liberty—prophetic sound!—that made kings tremble on their thrones and awoke within the hearts of men a new and strange enthusiasm. This flood had not yet abated its fury when Ireland, still burdened with the chains of English oppression, attempted to tear from her the trammels of a wicked system based on royal prerogative.

The soul of this movement was the Society of United Irishmen founded in 1791. Its primitive idea was to unite the Catholics and Protestants to bring about a much needed parliamentary reform for Ireland, and to improve its system of government.[1]

As early as 1792 the Society warned the Government of England against a continuance of its abuses, and threatened that, unless reforms were forthcoming, the people would soon be driven to embrace republicanism. The great minds of Ireland, at last thoroughly aroused, sought objects on which to employ their energies. Their thoughts were directed towards every means that would speedily alleviate the hardships and sufferings of their fellow-countrymen. Then was born that intellectual activity and moral earnestness which was to stir the souls of all true Irishmen, not only in their native land but also in that of their adoption—the United States of America.

This movement made itself forcibly felt through the medium of the press. The chief organs of the United Irishmen were the *Northern*

[1] *History of Irish Periodical Literature*, by Robert R. Madden. London: T. C. Newby, 1867. Vol. ii, p. 235.

Star[2] and the *Dublin Press*[3] both established in the nineties. The chief editor of the *Northern Star* was Samuel Neilson.[4] With him were associated eleven others, of whom the greater number were in the course of a few years counted among New York's foremost citizens.

Dr. Madden states that "the grand object of these papers seems to have been to keep the example and events of the French Revolution constantly before the eyes of the people."[5] The *Dublin Press*, during its brief existence, had many able contributors. Men of so wide literary reputation as Thomas Moore were writers for this paper. He, however, did not contribute matter of any particular moment. Among these men of letters were persons who soon afterwards became prominent in the early history of New York City. The "Montanus" Letters of Thomas Addis Emmett, written in the *Press*, excited the most attention. William Sampson, another of New York's citizens, wrote over the pen-name "Fortesque." Dr. MacNeven, their companion in exile, was also a man of considerable culture.[6]

While these Irish patriots were still in the midst of their struggles for liberty in the Emerald Isle, branches of the Society were being formed in America. We see traces of these activities as early as 1794. Mathew Carey, William Duane and others assisted the efforts of the parent society by their fearless advocacy of its doctrines, and that in the face of a Federalist opposition which was at that time beginning to manifest itself.[7] Reprints of the principal articles in the *Press* were published from the office of the *Aurora*, the mouthpiece of the Jeffersonian party.[8] The headquarters of the American branch of the United Irishmen gave aid and impulse to their friends across the sea, supplying them with funds—and arms were even promised should necessity demand such assistance.[9]

---

[2] *History of Irish Periodical Literature*, by R. R. Madden. London: T. C. Newby, 1867, Vol. ii, pp. 225–235.

[3] *Lives and Times of the United Irishman*, by R. R. Madden. London: J. Madden & Co., 1843, Vol. ii, Series 2, pp. 294–304.

[4] Samuel Neilson became an Irish exile in America and settled at Poughkeepsie, N. Y. See *History of Irish Periodical Literature* as cited above.

[5] *History of Irish Periodical Literature*, cited above, Vol. ii, p. 233.

[6] *Ibid.*, Vol. ii. Also *Lives and Times of the United Irishmen*, Vol. ii, Series 2, under their respective names. See also biography of Arthur O'Connor for details, regarding the *Press* in Vol. ii, Series 2. Also see *Ninety-eight and Forty-eight*, by A. S. New York: 1856, pp. 203-4.

[7] *Journal of the American Irish Historical Society*, Vol. iv, p. 69. Boston, 1904. Article by Edward O'Meaher Condon on *Irish Immigration to the United States since 1790*. Reprint from the *Pilot*, Boston, Mass.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 89. Also *Ninety-eight and Forty-eight*. See footnote, p. 205.

[9] *Journal of the American Irish Historical Society*, cited above.

The English Government looked with some apprehension on the strength and influence wielded by this sympathetic organization in America, and Sir Robert Lister, then Minister to the United States, set to work systematically to check, if possible, this concerted movement made by the members and friends of the Society in America.[10]

Sir Robert's efforts were, unfortunately, only too successful. He was on terms of closest intimacy with some of the highest officials in the American Government, and persuaded them that the presence of these Irish enthusiasts was a menace to American institutions and liberty.[11] The psychological moment arrived when the rebellion broke out in Ireland in 1798. Under pretense of danger from the Society of United Irishmen and their sympathizers in this country, President Adams took occasion to address a message to Congress, impressing members with the necessity of passing some suitable legislation relative to the admission of foreigners to the country and their residence here.[12] By the passage of this Alien Law a dangerous autocracy was established. Foreigners remained in the country at the mercy of the President. If they earned his displeasure, or if they were regarded as "dangerous," they might be compelled to undergo a term of imprisonment, to suffer perpetual disqualification from the rights of citizenship, or be obliged in the end to quit the country. At best they were merely tolerated, since fourteen years must elapse before they received the full rights of citizenship.[13]

As might naturally be expected, the opposition press, controlled principally by Irishmen,[14] challenged the President's action and criticized the Alien Law with a just severity. But Mr. Adams was not to be daunted. He succeeded in influencing Congress to pass a law which would make it a seditious libel to reflect on the conduct of the chief executive or to question the motives of Congress.

When the English Minister heard of the passage of the law, his joy knew no bounds. In a letter written in 1799 to the Governor-General

---

[10] *Journal of the American Irish Historical Society*, cited above.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 89.

[12] *The Irish in America*, by Edward O'Meagher Condon, p. 259.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 259. Also *Journal of the American Irish Historical Society*, cited above, p. 89.

[14] *Journal of the American Irish Historical Society*, Vol. iii, p. 63. Article on "Men of Irish Blood Who Have Attained Distinction in American Journalism," by Michael Edmund Hennessy, of the staff of the *Boston Daily Globe*. Matthew Lyon was the first to suffer under the Sedition Law. By a strange irony of fate Adams was defeated by the vote of Lyon when up for reelection against Jefferson. John Daly Burke was another man on whom Adams kept a sharp eye, intending to give him to British authorities. Aaron Burr, knowing this, aided Burke to escape. See Journal cited above, Vol. iii, p. 62 *et seq.*

of Canada, he related that some of the Federalists had "taken the law in their own hands and flogged one or two printers of the newspapers whose comments had offended them"; he told how this conduct "had given rise to much animosity, to threats, and to a commencing of armed associations among those opposed to the laws, particularly among the United Irishmen." "Some apprehended," he added, "that the affair may lead to civil war."[15]

This unjust attack on the liberty of Irish immigrants was also carried on with even greater malevolence at the seat of government in England. In this persecution, Rufus King, the American Minister at the Court of St. James, was to play a conspicuous part. The failure of the Irish Rebellion in 1798 led to the imprisonment of many of the leaders of the Society of the United Irishmen. In the latter part of that year, however, Thomas Addis Emmett, acting as a spokesman for his compatriots, obtained from the British Government a promise of perfect freedom[16] for them on condition that they would immediately quit English territory, never to return. They applied to the American Minister for passports to the United States—but Mr. King, in accordance with the wishes and sympathies of President Adams, refused to grant their request. Mr. Marsden, the Under Secretary of State, informed the prisoners, then confined in Fort George, Scotland, that Mr. King had remonstrated with the British authorities and bitterly opposed the emigration of these unsuccessful patriots to America. When asked by them why Mr. King hindered their departure to the United States, the Under Secretary evasively replied: "Perhaps Mr. King does not desire to have republicans in America." This refusal on the part of Mr. King to assist the Irish state prisoners gave a pretext to the government of Great Britain to detain them four years longer in confinement.[17]

At last the day of their deliverance came. About 1804 or thereabouts, the released patriots landed in America. Shortly after their arrival these exiles learned, with feelings of pain, the monstrous misrepresentations to which the majority of Irishmen were subjected. The

---

[15] *Journal of the American Irish Historical Society*, Vol. iv, pp. 89-90.

[16] The text of this treaty and its history, written by Dr. MacNeven, may be found in *Pieces of Irish History, Illustrative of the Conditions of the Catholics in Ireland, of the Origin and Progress of the Political System of the United Irishmen and of their Transactions with the Anglo-Irish Government*, published by W. J. MacNeven. New York: Bernard Dornin, 1807, p. 169 *et seq.*

[17] *The Irish in America*, by Edward O'Meagher Condon, pp. 260-61. See also *Letter of Rufus King to Henry Jackson, Esq.*, also *Letters of Thomas Addis Emmett to Rufus King*. (These may be found in *Pieces of Irish History, etc.*, cited above, pp. 281, etc. These letters may also be found in the files of the *Shamrock* for 1816, starting about March).

influence exercised against them by a hostile press was enormous; added to this were the bitter prejudices of the Puritanical Federalists, who scorned these foreigners as "bog-trotters" and "wild Irishmen."[18] Dr. MacNeven, writing shortly after his arrival in New York City, does not exaggerate the condition of affairs existing in this country when he states that "the same virulence and invective, the same violation of truth, the same distortion of fact, that marked the conduct of the English faction towards the United Irishmen in Europe, have been revived against them here by the retainers and hirelings of the same enemy."[19]

Self-protection, the bond that united Irish in Ireland in '98, now united these exiles and their sympathizers in America. The latter union was, however, a peaceful one, and consisted in the formation of such associations as the Juvenile Sons of Erin, Friends of Ireland, St. Patrick Benevolent Societies, and the like. The principal and very often the only local news items of the early Irish Catholic periodicals were the addresses and proceedings of such organizations. The purpose of these associations was, in some measure, the promoting of the external interests of Irishmen, especially the neutralization of existing prejudices sown broadcast by an unfriendly press, not only in America, but also in Europe. Hence it became necessary to encourage the formation of Irish periodicals in which the affairs of that nation might be truthfully stated. That need was to be met by Irish Catholic weeklies published principally in the two great centers of population, New York and Philadelphia.

[18] *The Irish Scots and the "Scotch-Irish,"* by Hon. John C. Linehan, p. 72.

[19] *Pieces of Irish History, etc.* Introduction by W. J. MacNeven, cited above.

DOCUMENTS

GUIDE TO THE MATERIALS FOR AMERICAN CHURCH HISTORY IN THE WESTMINSTER DIOCESAN ARCHIVES (1675-1798).

With the deprivation of the English Catholic hierarchy in 1559, a long period set in when the Church in the lands ruled by the English Crown was without episcopal leadership.[1] One of the main purposes of Elizabeth's government was to allow the imprisoned Catholic bishops to die off, one by one; and, having appointed Anglican bishops to their sees, to bring about a gradual change of religion.[2] With the single exception of Cardinal Allen, who was recognized at Rome as the representative of the English Catholics (1575-1594), there was no official head to the ancient Church in England. From 1598–1623 the Church there was ruled by the Archpriests Blackwell, Birkhead, and Harrison. From 1623–1655 Bishops William Bishop and Richard Smith were the recognized leaders. The following thirty years (1655–1685) were a period of interregnum.[3] In 1685, the English Vicariate-Apostolic was established with the appointment of Bishop John Leyburne. Three years later (1688), England was divided into four Vicariates, one of which was the Vicariate-Apostolic of London. From 1688 down to 1784, when John Carroll was elected Superior of the Missions in the Thirteen Original States, the jurisdiction of the London Vicars-Apostolic extended over all those territories in the New World where the rule of the English government was acknowledged. The question arises: What were the relations between the London Vicars-Apostolic and the Catholics in the English Colonies; and where should one search for materials for these relations? "The subject is an obscure one," writes Canon Burton, in his *Life and Times of Bishop Challoner*. "It has been passed over in absolute silence by all Dr. Challoner's biographers, and no information was available until Father Thomas Hughes, S.J., began his researches for his *History of the Society of Jesus in North America*."[4] Father Hughes has treated the problem of these relations in detail in his article: *The London Vicariate-Apostolic and the West Indies (1685-1819)*.[5]

The archival material for these relations is mainly to be found in three places: The Baltimore Diocesan Archives; the Archives of the Congregation of Propaganda Fide; and the Westminster Diocesan Archives. In the Baltimore Archives there are a few documents relating to the transition period under Bishop Challoner (1758-1781) and Bishop Talbot (1781–1784). The Propaganda Archives, which Shea used freely in the

[1] PHILLIPS, *The Extinction of the Ancient Hierarchy*. London, 1905.

[2] BIRT, *The Elizabethan Religious Settlement*. London, 1907; MEYER-MCKEE, *England, the Catholic Church under Elizabeth*, pp. 9-32. London, 1916.

[3] ULLATHORNE, *History of the Restoration of the Catholic Church in England*, p. 12. London, 1871.

[4] Vol. ii, pp. 123-148. London, 1909.

[5] *Dublin Review*, January, 1914, pp. 67–93, Vol. 124, No. 268.

second volume of his *History of the Catholic Church in the United States*, have been catalogued by Fish in his *Guide to the Materials for American History in Roman and other Italian Archives* (Washington, D. C., 1911). Shea also made use of the Westminster Archives. Among the Georgetown College Transcripts there is a manuscript: *Notes of a search made in the Westminster Archives*, dated March 23, 1887, which was sent at that time to Shea by Monsignor Johnson.[6]

Westminster became the See of the old London District at the Restoration of the Hierarchy in England in 1850.[7] Since that date, the Archives of the London District have been in the custody of the Archbishops of Westminster. "The documents at Westminster dating from 1509 to 1700 are bound in thirty-seven volumes, to which there is a manuscript index. Since many of the proceedings referred to in the eighteenth-century manuscripts were illegal (Roman Catholic priests being then under the ban of the law), personal names are often indicated by initials, and many of the papers are unsigned and undated." In the *Guide to the Manuscript Materials for the History of the United States to 1783, in the British Museum, in Minor London Archives, and in the Libraries of Oxford and Cambridge*, by Charles M. Andrews and Frances G. Davenport (Washington, 1908), from which this quotation is taken (p. 339), there is a short list of documents (twenty in all) relating to American history before 1783 from these Archives.

In 1914, the Westminster Diocesan Archives were divided as follows: (1) Thirty-seven bound volumes of original documents concerning the Church in England and the English Colonies from 1509 to 1700; (2) many bundles of unbound documents, not then classified, covering the later period 1700-1850; (3) pamphlets and other manuscripts. There was also a bound MS. catalogue for the bound volumes by the late Father Stanton of the Oratory. The two historical students who have made use of these Archives are Bishop Ward and Canon Burton. In a letter dated October 12, 1918, Bishop Ward writes from Brentwood to say that he does not remember having seen many relating to America. The period he studied began in 1781, and Canon Burton has given us all that he found in his chapter on *Bishop Challoner's American Jurisdiction* (1758-1781).

During the war, many volumes have been added to the bound volumes of manuscript, and a reorganization of the Archives has been

[6] Another depot is the Archives of the Old Brotherhood of the English clergy, formerly the English Chapter. These were in 1914 in the possession of the Secretary of the Old Brotherhood, Rev. Raymond Stanfield, at Hammersmith. There is a catalogue of these Archives in the Fifth Report of the Historical MSS. Commission (1876, pp. 463-476); but it is far from being complete. The writer has in his possession a MS. Catalogue of these Archives given to him by the late Superior of the Oblates of St. Charles, Bayswater, London.

[7] WARD, *The Sequel to Catholic Emancipation*, Vol. ii, p. 281. London, 1915.

carried on these past four years by Canon Burton. The main divisions of the Archives at Westminster, so far as regards material for American Church History, are now: (1) Bound volumes of Archives (1509–1799, *work proceeding*); (2) *Epistolae Variorum* (1700-1800) (not indexed); (3) *Correspondence of the Roman Agents* (this is all copied in bound volumes; and many of the originals are to be found in the Archives proper); (4) Bishop Challoner's Letter Book; and unclassified copy-books containing copies of letters, etc., such as may be found in (2).

The *Review* has undertaken a complete catalogue of references to America in these Archives through its London agent. Instructions were given to note every reference to America in general in these Archives from 1509 to 1799. No search, however, was made before the beginning of the seventeenth century, the agent being assured at Westminster that nothing was likely to be found before the beginning of the eighteenth century. The result was better than was expected, and the editor has been able to make use of the agent's personal notes in compiling this catalogue.

(1)

Archives, vol. xxxiv, 293, Feb. 29, 1675, in a copy of some "Special Missionary Faculties," mention is made of certain heretical books in America.

(2)

Ibid., Vol. xxxiv, 1037. Copy of Faculties granted (1685) by Bishop Leyburn to Fr. Thos. Church, for Jamaica.

(3)

Ibid., Vol. xxxv, 437. Nov. 13, 1687. Faculties granted by Bishop Leyburn to Fr. John Churchill, whom he appoints Superior of the Mission in Jamaica.

(4)

Ibid., Vol. xl, 173. Pamphlet, printed, 2 sheets. August 21, 1741. "The Defence of John Ury, made before the Supream Court in *New York*, at his Tryal for being concerned in the late Negro Conspiracy."

On the second sheet is given: "The Dying Speech of John Ury, Who was executed at New-York on Saturday the 29th of August, 1741, for being concerned in the Negro conspiracy." (It begins: "Fellow Christians!"). At the end is written in ink: "Printed by Andrew Bradford in Philadelphia."

(5)

Ibid., Vol. xl, 174. (Endorsed in faded ink: "Philadelphia, 1741"). One page; apparently that of a book or pamphlet; double columns; good print. "An abstract of a LETTER lately published in a neighbouring Colony, touching the horrid Practice and Delusions of some called NEW-LIGHT-MEN, lately sprung up in these parts."

(6)

Ibid., Vol. xl, 115. Undated letter in Italian; written in faded ink on faded paper in a tiny illegible flourishing hand. It is an account of the English Mission given by the Abbé Nicolini to Benedict XIV. It is approximately dated by cataloguer; "Between 1741 & 1758." But in the text there is mention made of the "ultima guerra civile, del 1745, é 1746." The first two paragraphs relate generally to England, Ireland and Scotland. Then follows a paragraph on the Church in Maryland.

(7)

Epistolae Variorum, Vol. xii. May 15, 1749. Letter from Rev. Alban Butler at Douay to Monsigner Stonor at Rome.

"The better sort of People say Maurepas's [disgrace] is owing to a settlement he made of 200 Families in the Isle Tobago, for the English refused to give up Cape Breton. At least his misfortune caused great Joy in the elector of Hannover's court at London, and upon the news of it orders were given to evacuate Cape Breton." (Extract.)

(8)

Bishop Challoner's Letter-Book, p. 31. Bp. Challoner to "Mr. Abraham" (the Pope); letter describing political innovations of the English laws relating to the marriage of Catholics, and further oppressions of the latter. There is a passing reference to the American Colonies. (1753).

(9)

Ep. Var., xiii, 135. September, 1756. Letter from Bp. Challoner to Msgr. Stonor at Rome. Important. Deals with (1) State of religion in our American Settlements. (2) As to the Islands. (3) Jurisdiction over same. (4) Some have wished they should have a Bishop or Vicar-Apostolic.

Endorsed in Stonor's hand: "Answered Dec. ye 21. 1756."

This letter is quoted in full by Canon Burton. (*Life of Bp. Challoner*, vol. ii, pp. 125–127).

(10)

Ibid., xiv, 26. August 17. 1758. In a letter of Rev. W. Green, Douay, to Msgr. Stonor at Rome there is a reference to certain calumnies and aspersions cast upon missioners in Paraguay.

(11)

Ibid., xiv, 25. October 31. 1758. Letter from Bp. Challoner (Fisher) to Msgr. Stonor at Rome. "The powers for America *ad sexennium* are dated January 7, 1757, so that there are above four years before they expire." (Extract).

(12)

Archives, Vol. xli, 7. March 31, 1759. Cardinal Spinelli to Bishop Challoner. Faculties for the Colonies.

(13)

Ep. Var., Vol. xiv, 58. June 11, 1762. Letter from Bp. Challoner (Fisher) to Msgr. Stonor at Rome.

"Your last favour was of March 9, in which you mentioned your having given in a memorial for the renewal of the extraordinary faculties March 4; which, I suppose, were then renewed; and have proceeded accordingly, by granting dispensations for Mariland: to which you know our faculties were extended by a grant of Ben. XIV. to Bp. Petre, January 29, 1757 (though he had always exercised jurisdiction there before). This extension was only *ad sexennium*, which expires next Janry. In the meantime I have not supposed that B. Petre's death made any alteration in this grant, but have gone on still giving faculties for those parts."

(14)

Ibid., *xiv*, 60. November 23, 1762. Letter from same (Deboren) to same. Refers to application received from S. C. Peter Lembec, a Jamaica merchant, has applied to the S. C. for a Missionary to Jamaica; for whose charges and expenses he will be responsible. Challoner is entrusted with the finding and sending out of this priest. But after making careful enquiries of many Jamaica merchants he can hear nothing of this Peter Lembec; "much less of any remittance from him." Jamaica sadly needs help, and "has the character of being a very wicked place." There are, no doubt, many Irish Catholics there, "such as they are." He will do his best to send a priest, can he identify Peter Lembec.

(Quoted by Burton, *ut sup.*, ii, p. 131.) This letter is translated into Italian in *Archives*, Vol. xli, 29.

(15)

In small MS. copy-book placed within Vol. i of *Epistolae Variorum*, containing copies of a few letters, No. 2 is a letter (copy) dated March 29, 1763, signed "Jacques, Evêque et Vic:", "Aux Acadiens de Southampton," exhorting them to peace and unity & cessation from quarrels, especially now in Paschal time. "Donné à Londres."

(16)

Ep. Var., *Vol. xiv*, 64. May 20, 1763. Letter from Bp. Challoner to "Mr. Christopher Stonor, to be left with Mr. Green, near the church of St. Jacques, at Douay. Near Calais in Flandres." (Endorsed by Msgr. Stonor; "ansd. June ye 28, 1763").

About jurisdiction over the Islands, and the difficulties attending this. (Quoted by Burton, *ut sup.*, ii, p. 132.)

(17)

Archives, *Vol. xli*, 33. July 9, 1763. Cardinal Castelli to Bishop Challoner. On the question of Jurisdiction in the English Colonies. The answer to this letter, translated by Shea, will be found in the ACHS *Researches*, Vol. xii, No. 1, 1895. Cf. Burton, *ut. sup.*, pp. 133-135.

(18)

Ep. Var., *Vol. xiv*, 72. (September 6, 1763). Letter from Bp. Challoner to Msgr. Stonor. Deplores the difficulty of administering the Islands, "at this vast distance from us," and declares that, "as to the missions upon the continent, to be sure, a bp. or Vic. Ap. in Canada or Florida would be most proper for them."

(Quoted by Burton, *ut sup.*, ii, p. 135.)

(19)

Ibid., Vol. xiv. 72. February 28, 1764. Unsigned letter from Rome to Fr. Alban Butler, referring to the affairs of the Island of "Dominico" as to an "anecdote" of which the writer was not "fully apprized."

(20)

Ibid., Vol. xiv, 73. March 15, 1764. Letter from Bp. Challoner to Msgr. Stonor (c/o Mr. Green). Important. He deplores the loss of a long account of the Mission which he had sent to "Mr. Castell" (Cardinal Castelli) at the latter's request. He gives an account of the state of religion in America (continent & Islands); and refers to the scheme for a Canadian Bishopric. (This is one of the most interesting of Dr. Challoner's letters. Quoted in full by Burton, *ut sup.*, ii, pp. 135–137).

(21)

Ibid., Vol. xiv, 75. May 19, 1764. Same to same. "The miscarriage of that letter concerning the state of the colonies, gives me some apprehension lest another letter sent by the same channel some time after in answer to Mr. Castell desiring my sentiments concerning the repeal of the clause of the sexennium, may not have reached that gentleman's hands: if you find it has not, I will repeat it again; it having been much the same in substance as that which you remember I sent to Mr. Spinelli on the same subject." (Extract).

(22)

Ibid., Vol. xiv, 76. July 13, 1764. Rev. Alban Butler, London, to Msgr. Stonor. Has been waiting to receive his maps of the English counties completed, & those of other countries: "Virginia in four great maps, Jamaica in as many, and Canada also in four, half a guinea each, I thought [North America] superfluous, as your North America comprehends all this, except a greater extent of forests." Appended is a table of prices of maps. "North America in four sheets £0. 5. 0."

(23)

Ibid., Vol. xiv, 77. August 28, 1764. Letter from Bp. Challoner to Msgr. Stonor at Douay. (Endorsed by Stonor; "Ansd. Sept. ye 27, but to be made further use of at Rome." Further endorsed: "Further answered. Dec. ye 12 1764"). Part relating to America begins: "I am also applied to by the Padri," and concludes: "our acquisitions in Florida."

Quoted in full by Burton, *ut sup.*, ii, p. 137.

(24)

Ibid., Vol. xiv, 79. October 2, 1764. Same to same. "You will have received some time ago my last, with regard to fac: for our new acquisitions 'tis necessary we should know if we have, or have not the power of granting them. As to the rest, we are not ambitious of engrossing to ourselves a jurisdiction over places so remote and where we can be of so little service: but rather heartily wish that something could be done in the way which Mr. Castal was speaking of; the more because 'tis a great pity, so that many thousand Christians should be deprived of the Sact. of Confirmation. This want seems to call loudly for the attention of superiors." (Extract).

(25)

Archives, Vol. xli, 39. December 24, 1764. Cardinal Castelli to Bishop Challoner. Regarding the Jurisdiction of the Church in the British Colonies.

(26)

Ep. Var., Vol. xiv, 81. February 15, 1765. Bp. Challoner to Msgr. Stonor at Douay. Settling two or three Vicars-Apostolic "in that part of the world is an object that certainly deserves the attention of our friends: but I forsee the execution of it will meet with very great difficulties: especially in Mariland and Pensilvania; where the padri have had so long possession, and will hardly endure a pt much less a B of any other institute, nor indeed do I know of any one of ours that would be fond of going amongst them; nor of anyone that would be proper for that station, who could be spared by us in our present circumstances." (Extract).

(27)

Ibdi., Vol. xiv, 83. May 31, 1765. Same to same. "I hope our friends will not stop the project of settling some Ap Vic in those parts you speak of. 'Tis morally impossible for us to have a proper superintendence over places so remote. And to let so many thousand Cath as there are in some of our Northeren Colonies, to remain entirely destitute of the Sact of Confirmation is what I am sure our friends [the Jesuits] will never suffer." (Extract).

(28)

Ibid., Vol. xiv, 102. September 12, 1766. Same to same. Alarm of the Jesuits on hearing of the proposed appointment of a Bishop for North America. Their opposition. The case of the Islands is even worse. (Quoted by Dr. Burton, *ut sup.* ii, p. 138).

(29)

Bishop Challoner's Letter-Book, p. 109. October 17, 1768. Letter to Fr. Fallon, O.S.F. on West Indian Mission. It is impossible, on account of his age and weakness and unnecessary on account of Fr. Fallon's "proceeding upon good and solid principles" to go fully into all the cases under discussion. By a recent Act of Parliament Catholics now had to present themselves before a Protestant minister to renew before him their contract of marriage. But this, he believes, does not apply to the Colonies. It is the duty of all Pastors to discourage Freemasonry. As to "the spl. jurisdiction in the Islands lately ceded by the French to G Br. the Holy See has thought proper p: interim to give it to us, till some other provision shall be made, which I heartily wish for, as being sensible of the impossibility of our having a proper superintendency over those and all the other British Islands lying at so great a distance, or even of our sending a Vic. G. with the power and necessary means to inspect all our . . . missions and to correct abuses &c." The priests in possession of Faculties before the cession of these Islands must renew them in London. His jurisdiction does not extend to the Danish or Dutch Islands. Is very sure the Sacred College would make no appointment in those parts without acquainting him.

(30)

Archives, Vol. xli, 59. July 29, 1766. Redated March 1, 1769. Petition of the Provincial of the Discalced Friars Minor of St. Gregory the Great in the Philippine Islands to the Pope. Begs that an English convert doctor, now a Tertiary, may become a Franciscan Friar.

(31)

Small ms. copy-book inserted in Vol. i of Ep. Var. June 25, 1770. Copy of letter evidently from Bp. Challoner to the Bp. of Quebec. Signature illegible. Not in Challoner's writing. [Exact copy].

Monseigneur:

Le Zèle du Salut des Ames et surtout de celles qui ont si recemment embrassé la Verité en l'Amérique Septentrionale, que Votre Grandeur a toujours fait paroitre m'engage de vous addresser des Personnes qui se sont addressées icy a mon Ancien et moi pour nous demander du secours spirituel pour les pauvres Acadiens, qu'il n'est pas en Notre Pouvoire de leur fournir, d'autant moins qu'ils ne parlent que François et nous n'avons que très peu de Prêtres qui soient habiles en cette Langue. J'ai Vus plusieurs de cette partie de l'Amérique qui etoient Prisonniers à Southampton pendant la dernière Guerre, et j'ai admiré avec tous ceux, qui les connoissoient, leur Religion. Ils demandoient toujours en premier Lieu, comme ils devoient les secours spirituels, que leurs compatriotes vous demandent encore aujourd'hui. Nous avons alors fait ce que nous avons pu, pour eux, et Nous ne doutons aucunement que Vous ne fassiez ce même à present. Que s'ils ne sont pas soumis à Votre Jurisdiction, il sont sera aise d'obtenir de Rome les Pouvoirs necessaires aux Prêtres, qui y seroient destinés. S'ils sont sujets de la Grande Bretagne comme leurs voisins de la Nouvelle Ecosse, et qu'ils n'ont pas d'Ordinaire, nous pouvons nous même donner ces Pouvoirs. Ce que Je remarque pour faciliter l'approbation des Prêtres qu'on pourra y envoier." etc. etc.

Londres. 25 Juin, 1770. A. Monseig. de Quebec.

(32)

Bp. Challoner's Letter-Book. November, 1770. Letter to Fr. Fallon, O.S.F., on the West Indian Mission. It gives great offence in the Island that Mr. Fallon contemplates purchasing an estate—a Franciscan becoming a Planter. The Rule of St. Francis ought first to be studied "that nothing may be done contrary to the vow of Poverty. Yea, & our Holy Father the Pope too, to Whom belongs the dominion of whatever is acquired by a Franciscan." He is convinced of the necessity of a Superior for the Islands; "it is what I have recommended to the Holy See, but hitherto have not been able to obtain their appointing such a one." He himself is unable to discharge such duty properly. "But in the interim till they shall think proper to nominate one or more, I shall not venture to appoint one myself."

(33)

Archives, Vol. xli, 111. December 19, 1770. Pamphlet, printed. "A Pastoral Letter addressed to the Catholicks of the British Islands in the West

Indies." Begins; "As the Catholicks of the British West Indian Islands, both priests and people, have been committed to our pastoral care and superintendency by the Holy See Apostolick," etc., etc., (Bp. Challoner).

(34)

Ibid., Vol. xli, 133. September 10, 1773. Bp. Challoner to the Cardinal Protector (Corsini). Description of the London District, in Latin. Towards the end occur the words: "De Americanis Coloniis et insulis Brittanico superio subjectis." The whole document is very illegible, even more so than is customary in Bp. Challoner's handwritting. Evidently a hasty copy of original.

(35)

Ibid., Vol. xli, 161. Undated, but probably 1773. List on half-sheet of letter-paper, in Latin. Bp. Challoner's writing. "Missioners in the W. Indies."

(36)

Ibid., Vol. xli, 207. Undated, probably 1773. Tiny slip in Bp. Challoner's writing. A list of the numbers of congregations in America. It runs:

Charles County 3675
St. Maries County abt 5000
St. George's County abt 2500
(?) Easton Shore abt 3000
Baltimore City abt 1300
Frederick abt 700
10375.

Pensilv. Philad. congreg. betwixt 2 & 3000. 3 Germans 4000.

(37)

Ibid., Vol. xli, 208. Undated, probably 1773. List of names of Jesuits. "*In Maryland*, John Lewis, Geo. Hunter. Bened Neale. Thos. Diggs. Cha. Roels. Jos. Mosely Ign. Matthews. James Walton. John Bolton. Pet. Morris *In Pensilvania*, Rob. Molyneux. Fer. Harmon Math. Manners. James Frambach. Jno Bapt de Ritter Bern. Rich."

(38)

Ibid., Vol. xlii, July, 25. 1782. Printed Pamphlet of three folio pages. "Extract of Proceedings respecting the Roman Catholics of the Province of Nova Scotia." Addressed to "The Honourable Sir Andrew Snape Hammond, Knt." Petition for a Relaxation or Repeal of "certain Grievious Laws, which in the Policy of former Times might seem necessary to be . . . but of later. . . have been deemed injurious and oppressive." June 18, 1782.

On July 4, the Lieutenant-Governor gave his assent to the Bill conferring the necessary relief (1) as to confirming titles to lands, etc.; (2) for suppressing Popery (*i. e.*, removing Catholic disabilities)

On July 6, the five petitioners returned thanks to the Governor, Council, and House of Assembly.

On July 8, they wrote an open letter to the Faithful of the Province announcing the Repeal, and declaring they relied on the assistance of the humane and well-disposed to erect a decent building for public worship, and to provide a settled Pastor; "great poverty having cursed us, the result of the unhappy contest between our Mother-country and the colonies on the continent." (Summary).

(39)

Ibid., Vol. xlii, 39. Ju'y 9, 1783. Monsignor Stonor to Bishop Talbot. Long letter, mutilated on last page. Relates to Regulars and to American affairs. "In regard to your American affairs he [Mgr. Borgia] told me that measures were taking for settling some sort of Epāl government for the Caths on ye continent. I guess the thing is managed by the French Ministry. He added as to your facs that they remain as usual in regard to ye British Islands but the provinces on the continent being no longer subject to the British government, and that acknowledged by treaty, those faculties as far as they relate to them cease of course."

(40)

Ibid., Vol. xlii, 44. January 14, 1784. Letter to Bp. Talbot from three gentlemen of Waterford. This letter is mis-stated in the Catalogue to be from the Bishop of Waterford; but in the text the following sentence occurs; "We presume our Bishop will in a few days," etc. The Roman Catholics of St. Johns, Newfoundland, have appointed the undersigned Commissioners, having obtained permission for the full exercise of their religion; and have unanimously called for the Rev. Mr. James O'Donell "of this city," to become their Pastor; he possessing a knowledge of Irish and of English, "the former absolutely necessary." He is to bring with him two other clergy from the diocese, as 78 per cent?] of the inhabitants of N. F. L. are from thence. "The favour and request we have now to make to your Lordship is that you will be pleased to vest and give full power to Mr. O'Donell for this mission, in order that it may be under his directions while there . . . and that no clergyman be suffered to officiate there but with his approbation;" the reason being that several apostate priests were in N. F. L., "a disgrace to themselves, to us, and our Holy Religion." *Signed* James Keating, Pat. Ganly, John Commins.

(41)

Ibid., Vol. xlii, 45. January 18, 1784. Letter to Bp. Talbot from John Thayer, Paris.

Most Revd. Sir,

The writer of ys letter is a native of Boston in America. After being a preacher in our heretical sect for more than two years, I came to Europe to gratify a strong thirst of useful knowledge. After a considerable time passt at Paris and London, I went to Rome. Excited by a curiosity of being exactly informed of evrything in yt city, I sought able persons to give me a full idea of the Catholic Faith, which pleased me to such a degree, that touched by omnipotent grace I've chearfully embrac'd it, at ye cost of ev'ry apparent worldly interest. Burning with zeal to impart to others that felicity which I experience myself I offered myself to ye Chief Pontiff for missions in my country." The Pope referred him to the Nuncio at Paris, who "thinks that the combination of my circumstances will cause two great eclat tho' the greater part of my friends at Rome & in France think yt this very combination wou'd naturally open the mission. However, it is not for me to judge. I therefore submit myself to ye Pope as to Christ." As his wish is not extinguished by the objections made he proposes to return to America in the spring

and to become a missioner among his friends. The purpose of the letter is to beg Bp. Talbot and the faithful of his acquaintance "to furnish me with the most able Controvertists and other books, such [as] short but faithful expositions of our doctrine, lives of ye Saints, ye best Catholic translations of ye bible, with whatever other books you may think adapted to remove prejudices and promote the great work. Surely you've a most ardent desire of enlightening that part of America [New England], which since its establishment has been the most envenom'd enemy to the catholic faith. Ignorance however has certainly been the cause, for the greatest sincerity and candour reign among them. . . . My confidence in God is great, tho' perhaps crosses are prepared for me; but crosses must precede the crown. Considering ye shortness of the time, you'll have ye goodness to acnow ys by the first opportunity by the same chanel by which you receive it . . . Whatever your zeal may excite you to do in ye good cause, I must pray you to do at your expence, both for the books and freight, I being utterly unable to defray the smallest expense. Shou'd you be dispos'd to correspond to my wishes, you'll have ye goodness to mark ye manner ye most easy of receiving your favours, for I can't point out a place to receive them, not knowing yet where I shall embark. I am, with all the respect due to your sacred character,

Your most humble servt

John Thayer.

(42)

This letter was wrongly placed in the Archives among the June documents of 1784. I believe it should occur here. See (49).

Ibid., Vol. xlii, 59. January 19, 1784. Letter from Fr. James Lewis O'Donell, O.S.F. to Bp. Talbot. Having been unanimously chosen by the Newfoundlanders to be their Spiritual Director, "I've consented to struggle with the difficulties of a voyage of 600 leagues, and the severity of a climate immoderately cold, to endeavour to promote the Honor of God in Interest of Religion." He has studied in Rome, has been Professor of Theology and Philosophy for four years in Prague, and afterwards appointed Commissary Visitator of the Province of Ireland. He was then made "Diffinitor," and in 1779 unanimously elected Provincial. "Should your Lordship think proper to gratify these people by appointing me for that mission I hunbly beg leave to inform you that it would be absolutely necessary to grant me Vicarial Power, as a fence against many unworthy Incroachers, who intend not only to goe to that country but even say they'l apply to you for Jurisdiction, the Bulk of the Inhabitants of New Found Land are Ignorant labouring men from this neighbourhood, and as it has been the general haunt of many immoral people these 40 years past, I foresee I must stumble upon many difficult cases, and as I have no opportunity if recurring to you but once a year it woud be necessary to grant me as ample and full power as possible."

(43)

Ibid., Vol. xlii, 47. February 4, 1784. Letter to Bishop Talbot from Dr. Egan, Bishop of Waterford, Clonmel, Ireland. The inhabitants of St. John's Newfoundland, who are mostly from Waterford, have applied to him to send them a priest; but he in answer, while encouraging their pious wishes, has said

that the matter depended rather on Bp. Talbot, "as it was always understood by us here, that the spiritul concerns of the Catholics in the Colonies of Great Britain were subjected by the Holy See to your jurisdiction, and that therefore, you principally were to be address'd by them on the occasion . . . They have, I believe, accordingly taken the liberty of addressing themselves to your Lordship." Follows a eulogy of Fr. James O'Donell, O.S.F., of "unexceptionably irreproachable conduct," and a zealous and regular preacher, "both in English and Irish, the latter highly necessary," as "most of them, on whom his labours are to be employ'd, speak nothing else." He was highly esteemed in the Order, of which he has been Provincial. The Bishop will miss him greatly, but will allow him to go, "as I persuade myself that his Mission will be serviceable, not alone to the Catholicks from these parts, trading to and residing in Newfoundland, but also to many others, particularly to the Natives, those born there, who tho' descended from European Parents, live and die alas! in the most deplorable ignorance of, and insensibility to, what regards their salvation, without instruction without sacraments, without sacrifice, and without the means of obtaining them. My heart has often bled for them in their forelorn situation, and I cannot but rejoyce" that through God's mercy these disabilities will now be removed. "If your Lordship will judge it adviseable to grant jurisdiction to Mr. O'Donel, your own discernment will best point out to you the measure, in which it will be fitting to extend it to him. Were I, however, to presume to hint an opinion to you, it wou'd be, that he be intrusted with your Vicarial Power, for such a limited time, as you will think proper, in Newfoundland. This will give to him all our ordinary communicable Faculties, which, considering personal and local circumstances there, seem to be absolutely necessary for him." Many invalid marriages are to be validated. It would even be desirable that he should have extraordinary Faculties from the Holy See; "for I foresee he will want them; they however may, under your Lordship's sanction, be explicitly obtained for him hereafter."

Another reason for his being entrusted with Vicarial power is the case of several Irish apostate priests of infamous character, who are scandalizing the faithful, and even the adversaries of religion. These must be "entirely discountenanc'd or at least reduc'd to proper subordination and regularity."

Two other priests have been applied for by St. John's. The Bp. of Waterford cannot spare them. He hopes another Franciscan may accompany Fr. O'Donell, and will communicate further with Bp. Talbot. In a postcript he adds that his Metropolitan, Dr. Butler, (of Cashel), "coincides entirely in sentiment" with him, upon the subject of a choice for St. John's.

(44)

Ibid., Vol. xlii, 48. March 9, 1784. Letter from Monsignor Stonor at Rome to Bishop Talbot, chiefly relating to the English College. He hopes the application of the good people of Canada will meet with a favourable reception, "tho' I foresee difficulties." Notwithstanding promises, little has been done for the Catholics in the United Provinces. "It must be some satisfaction to you that you are now no more concerned in what passes in that country."

(45)

Ibid., Vol. xlii, 52. June, 1784. Autograph letter of Bishop Talbot to the Cardinal Protector [Antonelli], about Newfoundland. "Accepi litteras de Superioribus ab ipsa [Sacra Congregatione] constitutis in Insula Terrae Novae et simul in tredecim [? Provinciis] Americae Septentrionalis, nostrae olim jurisdictioni subjectis," & c., & c., Ends: "Humillimus et obsequentissimus servus."

(46)

Ibid., Vol. xlii, 53. June 5, 1784. Brief from Cardinal Antonelli, at Rome, to Bishop Talbot. Latin. Directed by Monsignor Stonor. Endorsed by Bp. Talbot: "Mr. O'Donnell constituted superior of Newfoundland." Ordinary Faculties of a missionary for Fr. James Louis O'Donell, a Recollect of the Order of St. Francis, of the Diocese of Waterford, as Superior of the Mission in Newfoundland.

(47)

Ibid., Vol. xlii, 54. June 5, 1784. Duplicate of above.

(48)

Ibid., Vol. xlii, 55. June 9, 1784. Cardinal Antonelli to Bishop Talbot. Appointment of Rev. John Carroll to be Bishop of the United Provinces of America. (Latin).

The Holy See has decided to supply spiritual help to the thirteen provinces of North America, by a Bishop, or Vicar-Apostolic with Episcopal title. "Sacra haec Congregatio de Propaganda Fide approbante, SS^{mo} DM^{no} Nostro Pio P. P. VI. Superiorem illius Missionis constituit D. Joannem Caroll, virum probatae pietatis, ac studii, eumque facultatibus necessariis, et opportunij, independenter a quolibet alia Ecclesiastica potestate, praeterquam a S. Cong^{ne} communivit." (Endorsed in Bp. Talbot's writing: "About Mr. Caroll's appointment to be Bishop in America").

(49)

(It is possible that (42) should be inserted here, as it is in the Archives—as I believe, wrongly. The date, though very illegible, is evidently "Jan." not "June."

(50)

Ibid., Vol. xlii, 63. March 26, 1785. Cardinal Antonelli to Bishop Talbot. Latin. The Faculties for Fr. McEvoy in Sta Cruz are to be extended "ad insulas . . . . Anglorum Dominio subjectas in America."

(51)

Ibid., Vol. xlii, 65. May 31, 1785. Autograph letter of Bp. Talbot to Cardinal Antonelli. Reply to above. (Latin).

(52)

Ibid., Vol. xlii, 70x. August 22, 1785. Autograph letter of Bp. Talbot to Fr. Felician in Grenada. (Latin).

Now the war is over he hopes that the Jurisdiction in the Islands will be taken from him. "Et quidem rogavi, ut onus illud, quod grave nimis mihi videtur, ab humeris meis amoveretur." Directions on several subjects. Is away on his annual Visitation. Has received no answer to his last.

(53)

Ibid., Vol. xlii, 80. March 27, 1786. Cardinal Antonelli to Fr. McEvoy, Prefect-Apostolic of the Mission in the West Indian Islands, and those "conterminas in America." About renewal of Faculties. (Latin).

(54)

Ibid., Vol. xlii, 80. March 27, 1786. Same to same, Vicar-Apostolic of the Islands "in America." Decree of Propaganda, as to "facultatem celebrandi nova officia et Missas Sanctorum, necnon SS^mi Sacramenti, et immaculatae Conceptionis," etc.

(55)

Ibid., Vol. xlii, 82. March 27, 1786. Decree of Sac. Cong. appointing Fr. Edward Coen, Recollect of Friars Minor, as Missionary Apostolic in the Danish Isles of Sta Cruz, San Thome, and St. John's; "Necnon in Insula S. Eustachii Batavorum coeterisque conterminij in America, sub directione tamen, et Praefectura Dni Christophori MacEvoy."

(56)

Ibid., Vol. xlii, 81. Copy of the above.

(57)

Ibid., Vol. xlii, 83. April 8, 1786. List of Faculties granted to Fr. C. McEvoy, Vicar-Apostolic of the West Indian Isles, for seven years. Twenty-six Faculties, printed; with several MS. additions; notably (e.g.) no. 25, containing a short Index Expurgatorius, is annotated in fine script: Histoire critique de Jesus, Nouveaux Melangés Philosophiques, Historiques, et critiques, etc.

(58)

Ibid., Vol. xlii, 84. April 8, 1786. Letter of directions from Cardinal Antonelli to the Vicar-Apostolic C. McEvoy, then in London. Reminds him that his faculties were "ad septennium." (Latin).

(59)

Ibid., Vol. xlii, 85. April 8, 1786. Cardinal Antonelli to Bp. Talbot, about Fr. McEvoy. (Latin.)

(60)

Ibid., Vol. xlii, 86. July 12, 1786. Cardinal Antonelli to Bp. Talbot. (Latin.) Reminds him of appointment in June, [?Jan.] 1784, of Fr. O'Donnell to New Found Land in North America. The missionary has given great satisfaction, and now has Faculties which render his Mission independent of the Vicar-Apostolic in London.

(61)

Ibid., Vol. xlii, 88. August 2, 1786. Bishop Talbot to Cardinal Antonelli. (Latin.) An account of the London District. At the end there is a reference to the Island of Sta Cruz and others, and to the Newfoundland Mission.

(62)

Ibid., Vol. xlii, 100. August 18, 1787. Letter from Cardinal Antonelli to Bp. Talbot. (Latin.) About the Islands. Fr. McEvoy has delayed his return too long, as the Sac. Coll. has learnt. Bishop Talbot is to admonish him.

(63)

Ibid., Vol. xlii, 108. September 13, 1788. Pamphlet, printed, Philadelphia. "Act of Incorporation." Seven pages.

"*An Act* To incorporate the Members of the Religious Society of Roman Catholics, belonging to the Congregation of St. Mary's Church, in the City of Philadelphia." It has four sections, but is not given in full. "Signed. Thomas Mifflin, Speaker of the Gen. Assembly. Enacted into a law at Philadelphia, on Saturday, the thirteenth day of September, in the year of Our Lord one thousand seven hundred and eighty eight.

PETER ZACHARY LLOYD.
Clerk."

(64)

Ibid., Vol. xliii, 45. March 2, 1791. Letter from Rev. R. Smelt, Rome, to Mr. Horrabin 4, Castle Street, Holborn, London. "I have heard of Mr. Carrol's reception at Baltimore. A German Cistertian from Franconia who speaks English well & has resided in Rome these 7 years past, set out a few days ago for Leghorn to embark for America. In the Colledge of Propaganda Fide there are 2 American students sent by Mr. Carrol 2 years ago. Religion seems to thrive in America, tho' it loses ground in Europe: some time since Mr. Barnard was alarmed by some of our people proposing to go thither; if they could obtain leave from the Propaganda, as soon as this matter was mentioned I was afraid no such permission would be granted." (Extract).

(65)

Ibid., Vol. xliii, 51. March 8, 1791. Autograph letter from Bishop Carroll, Baltimore, to Bishop Douglass, London. (Sealed with large red seal; hat with ten tassels; arms defaced as if purposely, while wax was hot).

"My Lord

After wishing your Lordship a happy and prosperous administration of the district, to the care of which, I am now informed, that you are appointed; I take the liberty of solliciting a favour from you, in the very opening of my correspondence. A young man of your district, named Francis Tulloh, the son of a protestant Clergyman, had become a member of our Church some time before my arrival at London, last summer. Accident made us acquainted; and by a series of events, too tedious to relate to your Lordship, he came to see at London a most respectable French Clergyman, one of the principals of St Sulpice at Paris. In consequence of his interviews with this excellent Ecclesiastic, young Tulloh embraced the resolution and the offer of an education in that seminary, and thinks himself particularly called by God to dedicate himself to the service of my diocese. His director judges his call to come from Heaven, and encourages it: and it is at their joint request, that I presume to petition your Lordship to grant to Francis Tulloh the necessary excorporation from your Diocese, that he may become subject to me and my successors, and receive orders either from or in virtue of Dimissorials granted by me or them. I request the favour of having it sent to Paris, to be delivered to Monsr l'Abbé Nagot, Directeur du Grand Seminaire de St Sulpice, à Paris.

May I presume to desire your Lordship to give my respectful compliments to the Rev. Gentlemen in Castle Street.

I have the honour to be, with respect and veneration,
My Lord,

Yr Lordship's most obdt & humble St.
+ J. Bishop of Baltimore.

Mr. Tulloh is mentioned by Shea (Vol. ii, p. 379), as one of the original band of seminarians who volunteered to come to Baltimore for the new Seminary, in 1791.

(66)

Ibid., Vol. xlv, 168. July 6, 1793. Letter from Rev. R. Smelt, Rome, to Bishop Douglass.

"Enclos'd you have a renewal of the French Faculties, but nothing further as yet; the Cardinal has ordered the Archivium in the Propaganda to be searched; to see in what manner the French islands in the W. Indies are governed. I believe the Superiors are styl'd *Praefecti Missionis*."

(67)

Ibid., Vol. xlv, 218. October 12, 1793. Same to same. Nothing can be done about the Faculties for San Domingo until the Cardinal's return in November after the holidays, this year much needed, as the heat has been insupportable. It must first be decided to what Power that part of the island is to belong.

(68)

Ibid., Vol. xlv, 48. May 17, 1794. Brief. Cardinal Antonelli to Bishop Douglass. About San Domingo. (Latin).

The Holy Father and Sac. Cong. desire Bp. Douglass to send the best missionaries there, and to signify their names, that they may be inscribed in the Archives of the Sac. Cong. The Marquis de Choiseul, a pious and zealous Catholic, has much property in the island and will protect them. "Vicarius Apostolicus constituatur, in eoque officio presbyter Latill, Vicarius Generalis, Episcopi Vimiensis eligatur . . . . . Idem autem Latill Facultatibus Missionarii Apostolici ab hac sacra congregatione donatus est, ita tamen ut sub dependentia Amplitudinis Tuae sit, ministeriique excercitium a te recipiat."

(69)

Ibid., Vol. xlv, 85. August 20, 1794. Document. (Latin.) Endorsed by Bp. Douglass: "Petition for Faculties for French Bishop intended for San Domingo, wch Faculties were granted to Monsr Osmond, B of Comminges, but Monsigr Erskine through Edmund Burke Esqr. prevented the B going and the Faculties being delivered."

(70)

Ibid., Vol. xlv, 86. August 20, 1794. Letter from the Duke of Portland to the Bishop of Comminges. (French).

Begs him to become Bishop of San Domingo as soon as the necessary formalities prescribed by the Roman Catholic Church can be fulfilled; the King's [George III] intention being to re-establish and to maintain that religion in the Island.

(71)

Ibid., Vol. xlv, 87. Undated. The Faculties for San Domingo. (Latin. Same hand as text of (69)).

(72)

Ibid., Vol. xlv, 88. August 22, 1794. Letter from the Marquis de Choiseul, at Standen Hall, Clithero, [Lancashire], to Bp. Douglass. (French.) The appointment two months ago of the Vicar-General Latill was owing to his own memorial to Rome, but Latill is apparently unaware of his nomination and is still at Düsseldorf. Will Bp. Douglass send for him to London?

Since the expulsion of the Society of Jesus the Island [San Domingo] is in a terrible state. A French priest is required, and an excellent one has been found.

(73)

Ibid., Vol. xlv, 89. September 16, 1794. Letter from the Abbé Latill at Düsseldorf to Bp. Douglass. (French).

Has only just received a letter from the Marquis de Choiseul, dated August 21, acquainting him with his nomination as Vicar-Apostolic of San Domingo two months ago. Apologises for delay in replying, and humbly and gratefully accepts office.

(74)

Ibid., Vol. xlv, 90. October 2, 1794. Pamphlet, printed. (French.) 4 pp. Port-au-Prince. "Extrait des minutes du Greffe du Conseil-supérieur de Saint Dominique."

(75)

Ibid., Vol. xlv, 101. October 1, 1794. Brief. Cardinal Antonelli to Bp. Douglass. (Latin).

The Holy Father hears with great joy that the King of England will allow a Catholic Bishop in San Domingo, to fight the shameful Gallican schism, which has penetrated to its remotest regions.

(76)

Ibid., Vol. xlvi, 62. July 1, 1795. Letter from the Superior of St Sulpice, R. P. Bourret, London, to M. l'Abbé Dumont in Martinique. (French).

Encloses copy of letter from the Archbishop of Paris, (dated August 30, 1794), giving permission for P. Dumont and another priest to go to Canada, "pour y chercher les fonctions du St Ministère."

Both these priests being of the Diocese of Orleans, but their own Bishop being at present in a state "actuelle et déplorable," P. Bourret has addressed himself, for this permission, to the Metropolitan, now at Constance.

(77)

Ibid., Vol. xlvi, 68. July 18, 1795. Bishop of Quebec, at Quebec, to Bp Douglass. Complimentary letter of thanks. (French). Has seen Mr. Douglass, the Bishop's nephew.

(78)

Ibid., Vol. xlvi, 71. August 9, 1795. Letter from Mr. Thomas Douglass to his uncle, Bishop Douglass. Written from Quebec. (English).

Arrived safely on July 7. Has been too busy for meals this week, an order having come "to load your wheat vessels to go under convoy for Government." The workmen mind neither master nor man. "The Canadians about here are as stubborn as brutes and so ungrateful that we are oblidged to beg and pray and give them everything they ask for to work." Nevertheless, he "likes the country very well."

(79)

Ibid., Vol. xlvi, 72. August 10, 1795. Letter from Robert Morrogh to Bishop Douglass. Written from Quebec. (English).

Is delighted with Thomas Douglass, who is staying in his uncle's family. The Bishop of Quebec desires to thank Dr. Douglass for promising to forward his letters to Rome. He will take advantage of this offer.

(80)

Ibid., Vol. xlvi, 169. March 20, 1796. Copy of Faculties given by Fr. Archangelus, "Praefectus per interim Missionis Capucinorum in antinsulis Americanis," to "S. Domino Dumont, praesbitero." (Latin).

(81)

Ibid., Vol. xlvi, 200. March 13, 1796. Letter from Fr. Archangelus, at Fort Royal, apparently to English-speaking priest, deploring his own ignorance of English, and accepting proffered help in certain cases.

(82)

Ibid., Vol. xlvi, 263. November, 1796. From the Marquis de Choiseul, "Conseiller du Conseil Superieur de St Dominique," to Bp. Douglass. (French). Long statement about affairs in San Domingo.

(83)

Ibid., Vol. xlvi, 264. November, 1796. Letter from the Apostolic Prefect of Martinique Mission to the brother of the Abbé Dumont. (French). Reassures him as to his brother's health.

(84)

Ibid., Vol. xlvii, 6. January 20, 1797. Letter from Rev. James Loughlin to Bp. Douglass.

Having received a temporary commission from Fr. Archangelus of the West Indian Mission, he had already applied for jurisdiction from London. "Being now in my 20th year from Ireland and knowing but little of the state of England, etc.; I took it for granted that the Immortal Doctr Challoner was an Arch Bishop, and supposing your Lordship to be one of his successors I scarcely doubted of your having the same title." Has been censured. Will send authenticated copy of his recantation.

(85)

Ibid., Vol. xlvii, 97(1). November 10, 1797. Letter from a French Religious, R. P. Trepsac, O. P., at St. Pierre, Martinique, to M. l'Abbé Dumont. (French). Addressed to London, and redirected to Martinique by Bp. Douglass.

(86)

Ibid., Vol. xlvii, 106. December 2, 1797. Faculties granted by Bp. Douglass, Vicar-Apostolic of the London District, to the Rev. Fr. Eustace Louis

Dumont in London District and West Indian Islands. Preceded by a testimonial from R. P. Bourret, Superior of St. Sulpice.

(87)

Ibid., Vol. xlvii, 175. May 29, 1798. Letter from Bishop Sharrcok, at Bath, to Bishop Douglass. (English).

Informs him of the desire of the wealthy planters of Martinique to found a Catholic College, of which the Superior should be Mons. D'Ancel now at Old Hall Green. (This is endorsed, after a summary: "Mr. Wilks's refusal").

(88 to 95, inclusive.)

Ibid., Vol. xlvii, 197 (The following papers on Martinique are arranged together). March 16, 1798. Act of Rev. Fr. François Augustin. Trepsac, O. P., Superior General of the Dominican Mission, in the French Isles, instituting Fr. Louis Dumont to the parish of La Souffrière, in Ste Lucie. (Endorsed: "ma nomination à la cure, etc., dont j'ai pris possession le 18 Mars, 1798.) (French.)

(89)

Ibid., Vol. xlvii, 198. April 7, 1798. Letter from same to same. (French). Congratulates him on safe arrival at La Souffrière.

(90)

Ibid., Vol. xlvii, 199(1). April 21, 1798. Letter from Fr. Dumont to Bp. Douglass. (English).

(91)

Ibid., Vol. xlvii, 199(2). Easter Sunday, 1798. Letter from French Religious to Fr. Dumont. (French. Very illegible.)

(92)

Ibid., Vol xlvii, 200. May 7, 1798. Letter from R. P. Trepsac to Bp. Douglass, from St. Pierre. Regrets the terrible situation in Europe, especially as regards the Holy Father. Asks counsel as to Dispensations.

(93)

Ibid., Vol. xlvii, 201. May 22, 1798. Letter from R. P. Trepsac, O. P., to R. P. Dumont at La Souffrière. (French. Long.)

(94)

Ibid., Vol. xlvii, 202. July 24, 1798. Same to same. (French).

(95)

Ibid., Vol. xlvii, 205. July 8, 1798. Letter from Rev. Leonard Neale, Pastor of St. Mary's Church, Philadelphia, to Bp. Douglass.

A Londoner named John Quinn who has recently married in this city, gave out that his former wife, "the Widow Burd," was dead; but is utterly unable to bring proofs. The father of his second wife begs that these may be given. He was formerly a worshipper at St. Patrick's, Soho.

The worthy Miss Arnold, who was an example of Christian piety, is just dead of yellow fever.

"Our city, the Lord be praised, is now very healthy. Religion florishes beyond what the complexion of the times would seem to admit." (Endorsed by Bp. Douglass, after a summary: "ansd Oct. 3, 98").

(96)

Ibid., Vol. xlvii, 210. July 12, 1798. Letter from Fr. D'Ancel, at Follaton Mr. Petre's, Devonshire, to Bp. Douglass. (English).

About the Martinique College plan. He has flatly refused the office of Superior, as the proposal did not come from the Bishop; but holds himself ready in this and all other things to obey him.

(97)

Ibid., Vol. xlvii, 239. October 15, 1798. Autograph letter from Bp. Douglass to R. P. Dumont, La Souffrière. (English).

Congratulates him on being in charge of a parish. "Now you are in the sacred ministry, the great and sublime employ, for which you were ordained Priest."

After the fiery trial of deportation from France, and the Revolution, he has been called by Heaven, and given a distant post. "O may your Islands be preserved from the schism, heresy and immorality of these dreadful times."

His Holiness is still in the Certosa near Florence, very infirm in health. "How much have we to fear when he shall be called from the world. You will pray for the Holy Father: you will pray for the Church: pray also for England, and pray for me."

The *Agents Correspondence* (2 vols.) now contains the copy-book of Monsignor Christopher Stonor who was English agent of the Vicars-Apostolic from 1748 to 1790. This book, formerly in the Southwark Diocesan Archives, contains the *Summary of the State of the Church in the English Colonies of America*, written in Italian and dated 1764. A translation appeared in the *U. S. Catholic Historical Magazine*, Vol. iv (1888), pp. 206–212. The *Catholic Record Society Publications*, now in their twentieth volume, contain valuable manuscripts and letters from private and family archives in England; many of these volumes are indispensable for American Catholic history and supplement to a great extent the materials in the Westminster Diocesan Archives.

PETER GUILDAY.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Frontier States. By Theodore Calvin Pease. The Illinois Centennial Commission, Springfield, 1918.

The "monumentum aere perennius" of the first centenary of Illinois statehood is to be a five-volume history of this great western commonwealth which, in a brief span of time, has outdistanced most of the original colonies. It is a new and happy departure in the way of celebrations, and while during the centennial year the usual speeches and pageantries were not overlooked, their value is transient in comparison with the permanent record of success through failure embodied in these volumes. For future generations they will prove a rich mine of valuable information. The first volume in the series, by Professor Buck, gave a general account of Illinois and its people at the time of their admission to statehood. The present volume carries the history forward from 1818 to 1848. During that formative period of thirty years Illinois was indeed the "frontier state." Pioneers passed over its territory in waves with varying manners, ideals and habits of life. The half-breed and the college-bred lawyer, the woman of the backwoods and the fine lady rubbed elbows in the little village where the frame house was rapidly replacing the log cabin. All were equally eager to possess their share of the vast stretches of diversified hill and plain, forest and prairie that lay so invitingly to hand. And all had to wage a continual political fight to obtain from their landlord, the Federal Government, the lowest possible terms for the acquisition of the coveted treasure; in 1820 Illinois land was sold at one dollar and twenty five cents per acre.

But it is the settlers themselves who interest us most. For they not only made the land what it is; they also fashioned and shaped the habits and hopes, the ideals and aspirations of the generations that followed; we of today are the heirs of their accumulated material and spiritual wealth. In the Illinois frontiersman there was none of the self-conscious, awkward rusticity of the European peasant. As one to the manner born and bred on the doctrines of liberty and equality, the conviction of his own dignity was apparent in the bearing and conversation

of every inhabitant. Money could not buy any obsequiousness on his part. But if he were appealed to as a man for help and sympathy, he usually responded in liberal measure. Intensely patriotic and inordinately fond of politics, where he found ample scope for the exercise of his most cherished rights and privileges, he believed with uncommon ardor in the destiny of the American nation as the world's standard-bearer of republican principles. Doubts and fears concerning the baneful influence of the foreigner on America's future were far removed from his mind; he could see no danger ahead as long as free and firm adherence to the fundamental tenets of democracy rapidly transmuted every new arrival into a staunch and true American. Such at least was the general attitude about 1820. Some years later a decided change set in.

If it is true that people are known by the papers they read and that publishers supply what the readers demand, then the general average of culture in early Illinois was fairly high and of a decidedly different stamp from that of today. Editors thought it their duty to keep from their readers anything that might be considered contrary to good manners and morals. On occasion they even rebuked as mere idle curiosity the desire for the details of murders and steamboat explosions; divorces were practically unknown. The paper's main function was to furnish a medium of polite communications from the editor to his patrons. Such foreign news as could be clipped from papers nearer the center of the great world; accounts of the proceedings of Congress and of the state general assembly; occasional speeches, political articles and forecasts, and oftentimes lengthy communications from readers on some theme of local or general interest, made up the bulk of the reading matter.

Public schools and free education were unknown. Such systematic instruction as the state afforded was supplied by private schools, and for a price. These private schools were connected with some religious denomination and pervaded by its teachings. Father Desmoulin had a school in Kaskaskia, where he taught Latin and French. Yet the frontiersman was quite often unreligious. Both from Catholic and from non-Catholic sources there is ample evidence to prove that there was a serious widespread disregard of religious observances. If deistic and

atheistic beliefs flourished even among the better classes, there was also a compensating advantage. "A man of good character," thus wrote an eyewitness, "is an acquisition; not that there is a small proportion of such men, but because the bad are as undisguisedly bad as their opposites are professedly good. This is not the land of hypocrisy. It would not here have its reward. Religion is not the road to worldly respectability, nor a possession of it the cloak of immorality."

The political institutions of early days were, of course, little different from those of the present time. However, the first Illinois Constitution grafted a unique and very curious body on the legislative department—the council of revision. It was composed of the governor and the justices of the Supreme Court. Its duty was to examine all laws passed by the house and senate, and to return such as it disapproved, which last could be passed over its veto by a majority of the members in each house. In practice the institution prevented useless legislation by calling to the attention of the legislators technical defects in laws passed. It also acted as a check on the extravagant expenditure of public money to no purpose. Thus in 1827 it protested that "vast sums from the public treasury have been thrown away on commissioners to view and mark out roads which have never been and never will be opened"!

The early criminal codes of Illinois serve as an index to an attitude of mind that was a stranger to maudlin sentimentality where evil-doers were concerned. By the criminal act of 1819 four offenses were punishable by death. From this list the code of 1827 subtracted assault and arson, unless a life were lost in the fire, while adding two corollary offenses. As to punishment by whipping, this same code, while applying it to nine offenses, including crimes of violence, forgery, counterfeiting, and altering marks and brands, cut down the number of lashes. In certain cases the code of 1819 prescribed 500 lashes, but the later code in no case exceeded 100. To the honor of Illinois be it said that in 1819 and 1827 acts were passed against dueling, the first of them limiting the death penalty to the principals, and the second making participatitn in a fatal duel murder.

Perhaps few commonwealths in the nascent republic paid so dearly for their indomitable progressive spirit as did Illinois.

Its early builders understood fully that easy and rapid means of communication with the world beyond their borders meant everything to the State. On all sides there was a clamor for the building of roads, railways and canals. But when it came to realize all these ambitious projects, and especially to providing the means, the State and its bondholders got quickly entangled in a mesh of financial difficulties and failures which it took years to unravel. Nothing daunted, the energetic pioneers set to work again, and deserved success attended their efforts in the end.

Interwoven in the web of these manifold activities were the struggles with the vanishing Indian aborigines, with the growing and threatening Mormon settlement in Nauvoo, and especially with the pro-slavery element. Certain ideals lay close to the heart of even the backwoodsman; they were never lost sight of, and the consciousness of their distant realization seemed only to intensify the zeal with which they were defended and to infuse new life into their protagonists after every failure. The oft-told story of Elijah Parish Lovejoy and his untimely end at Alton is but one instance among many.

Intimately bound up with the progress of Illinois are the rise and rapid growth of Chicago. During the period with which this volume deals, it was fast becoming the great emporium of the whole western country, although then even the most optimistic would not have dared to foretell its present size and importance. As a central and easily accessible point for imports and exports it had not and could not have a rival—its geographical situation was absolutely decisive. The rich farming belt surrounding it made it the supreme market for grain and all other produce, where profiteering, even in those early days, seems to have been practiced on a large scale. And when prices were artificially forced downward, "many would hold up their commodity a whole year, expecting a rise in the market. . . . I have known whole stacks of wheat and whole fields of corn to rot, or to be dribbled out and wasted to no purpose and whole droves of hogs to run wild in the woods so as never to be reclaimed whilst the owner was saving them for a higher price."

Although the great emancipator and savior of the union stood not as yet revealed in all his might, Illinois at this time

was beginning to feel the influence of his personality and the power of his word, as well as the nation at large. Especially was this the case during the Mexican war. Illinois had rallied enthusiastically to the call for soldiers, and, raw recruits as they were, they had markedly distinguished themselves, particularly at the battle of Buena Vista. Yet, Lincoln had consistently opposed the war from the first, and stigmatized it as one of "rapine and murder, robbery and dishonor." He felt that Illinois had sent her men to Mexico "to record their infamy and shame in the blood of poor, innocent, unoffending people, whose only crime was weakness." In a speech before the house, January 12, 1848, he declared that President Polk "is deeply conscious of being in the wrong; that he feels the blood of this war, like the blood of Abel, is crying to heaven against him; that originally having some strong motive . . . to involve the two countries in a war, and trusting to escape scrutiny by fixing the public gaze upon the exceeding brightness of military glory—that attractive rainbow that raises in showers of blood, that serpent's eye that charms to destroy—he plunged into it, and was swept on and on till, disappointed in his calculation of the ease with which Mexico might be subdued, he now finds himself he knows not where!" His uncompromising attitude was deeply resented by his opponents, but his patriotism was never questioned. However stirring the record of past events, especially when viewed in the light of present achievements, the Catholic historian always feels particular concern in the part his co-religionists took in them. Catholic history can be sympathetically understood and written only by Catholics, and Illinois has much to do in this regard. In a book like the present one does not expect and does not look for a detailed treatment of Catholic men and their contributions to the common fund of civilization. Yet justice demands that they be not passed over in absolute silence. In a review of the first volume of this series (*Cath. Hist. Review*, Vol. iv, No. 1), attention was called to this point, and the present work gives due credit to Catholics for their share in the development of a state which owes its very existence largely to Christian endeavor.

The French-Canadian Catholics, as the first white settlers, had prepared the way for the advance of the white race on Illi-

nois soil. Untoward circumstances had forced them to emigrate in large numbers across the Mississippi. Yet the school of Father Desmoulin, of which mention has already been made, was kept alive. Besides, in 1833 the convent of the Sisters of the Visitation was established in connection with the Menard Academy at Kaskaskia, and three years later it opened a commodious building to pupils. By 1842 eighteen Sisters had the care of seventy pupils, twelve of whom were orphans, taught free of charge. Tuition for the curriculum of literature, music and arithmetic was one hundred and twenty-five dollars a year, and twenty-five dollars for day students. In 1844 the school building was practically destroyed by the Mississippi flood, and this academy was moved to St. Louis. But Catholic day schools were maintained at Cahokia, La Salle and other places in the State.

With the advent, between 1830 and 1850, of a large number of Irish immigrants, nativism began its political machinations. Among the Whigs there was always a strong current of native American sentiment, which the Democrats, intent on securing the foreign vote, were not slow to bring it to the surface. In most instances where it appeared overtly in Illinois, this sentiment was expressed in the question as to whether newly arrived immigrants to the United States should be permitted to vote. At least one Illinois paper in 1838 openly denounced the practice of allowing the "Irish of the canal zone" who had been six months in Illinois, to vote, whether they had been naturalized or not. From the fact that even the naturalized Irish immigrants should be deprived of the vote, it was apparent that, besides patriotism, an unavowed motive was animating nativists in their campaign. At that time the Irish vote in Cook County was said to be one-half of the total. When the Whigs, who were emphatically Protestant, were accused, in connection with nativist attacks, of being anti-Catholic, the charge was more than a political maneuver. It was not so much "a certain aggressive loyalty to all things Irish" as to all things "Catholic" that "drew a sharp line of antagonism between the Irish and their Anglo-Saxon neighbors." And be it said in passing that "the canal zone Irish" laid the foundation of more than one now prosperous and populous Catholic settlement in the nascent cities and the surrounding farming territory.

Mention is also made of "The London Roman Catholic Emigration Society," which "hastened to complete preparations whereby various parties, each with its clergyman at its head, might find new homes in America." How many Catholics responded to this call, or what became of their Illinois settlements, does not appear. In 1850 there were 28,000 Irish in Illinois and 18,600 English settlers. With regard to the latter it is on record that "their minds were hampered with prejudices in favor of the customs and habits of the mother country, which, combined with the lack of those qualities that make good pioneers, kept the English from being classed with the successful settlers of the new country."

There were also a number of Catholics among the German immigrants to Illinois. Strangely enough, the vanguard and leaders of this Teutonic contingent became known as the "Latin farmers," for they knew more of Latin than of land. They brought to Illinois an element of culture and education that was in the long run to affect the life of the community. From the first they made no effort to isolate themselves from that life; though they furnished themselves with new and better homes, flowers and fruit trees, books and music, they at the same time adapted themselves to the simple, social standards of the people about them, and thereby gradually elevated the ideals of western life. Their influence was felt in farming, in commerce, in journalism, science, art and government; and in religion also, for the Catholic portion of them strove hard and successfully against many odds to build up with scanty means their churches and schools. They also became the butt of native-American antagonism.

During the period under consideration the largest number of Catholics in Illinois was drawn from those four countries: Canada, Ireland, Germany, England. The immigration from other countries, especially from Scandinavian lands, was overwhelmingly and uncompromisingly Protestant.

In his last chapter, "Social Advance," the author reviews in a comprehensive manner the progress made in Illinois by various sects and also by Catholicity. In 1826 there were, according to Bishop Rosati's report, 20 missions, mostly French, in southern Illinois. Their needs were supplied by missionaries sent out

from St. Louis. But beginning slowly in the thirties, and increasing rapidly in the forties, came that tide of Catholic immigrants, predominantly Irish and German, who, settling in great numbers in the northern section of the country, shifted ecclesiastical emphasis to the north and made Catholicism an important factor in state development. In 1833 these northern Catholics obtained their first resident pastor in the person of Father Irenaeus Mary St. Cyr. Chicago, where he resided, was incorporated the same year, the Catholics then numbering 130, or 90 per cent of the population. From that year dates the rapid growth of Catholicity in the city by the lake.

Professor Pease's thorough and impartial treatment of his theme deserves many imitators. While complying with scientific requirements in referring constantly to original sources, his work is by no means overburdened with notes and is in no wise pedantic. It is well calculated to satisfy both the ordinary reader and the more inquisitive historian.

J. B. CULEMANS, PH.D.

National Progress, 1907–1917. By Frederic Austin Ogg, Professor of Political Science, University of Wisconsin. New York and London: Harper & Brothers, 1918. Pp. xxii+419.

Professor Ogg's book is the 27th and concluding volume in the series published from original sources under the editorship of Albert Bushnell Hart, entitled *The American Nation, A History*. The purpose of the present volume is to afford the student of history an opportunity to view, in a single compact volume, the various events, issues, and tendencies which have made the decade from 1907, to the Declaration of War in 1917, one of the most interesting as well as one of the most eventful since the Civil War in the development of the United States as a nation. As the editor of the series points out in the Introduction, it is always a difficult task to write a critical and balanced narrative of recent events. For one thing a proper perspective is lacking and our judgment is apt to be influenced by personal factors. Some time must pass before one can profitably indulge in a calm analysis of events and appreciate their full significance and casual relationship. While a study of this kind therefore

can lay no claim to finality, it is yet undoubtedly useful, for it contains the sources from which the historian of the future must draw his premises. It is useful, too, in that it furnishes a key to the understanding of contemporaneous events, since it stresses the connections between events, uniting them in the broad general tendencies and movements of which they are parts. For these purposes Professor Ogg's book will be found very valuable. Attractive in style, calm and detached in treatment, it sketches the chief events of the decade with clearness and commendable accuracy of detail.

The first part of the book is taken up with an account of the problems of internal or domestic policy which arose during the ten years. In his treatment of these questions, however, the author does not always confine himself to the dates prefixed, but goes beyond them, as is proper, when it is necessary to show their historical development and trace their causes.

Looking back over that period and recalling to mind the many vexed questions, difficult problems and bitter discussions to which it gave rise, one has little difficulty in accepting the author's estimate of the decade as one of great national restlessness and reaction against the old order in business, politics, and government. The United States had just passed through an era of wonderful industrial expansion and great material prosperity. Huge trusts and industrial combinations had arisen and frenzied finance had run rampant. Big Business had entered the field of politics and in the popular mind appeared to dictate and control the processes of government. Legislation seemed to be dictated largely by conservative and standpat principles rather than by principles of true progress. In consequence there arose a strong popular reaction and protest which began to gather force and crystallize under Roosevelt and though it lagged somewhat under the administration of Taft, under the leadership of Wilson it acquired new strength. In the chapters on "Railroad Regulation," "Corporations and Trusts," "The Democrats in Power," the author shows how in obedience to the popular demand business was divorced from politics, the death-knell of lobbyism was sounded and measures taken to insure the triumph of the people. The growth of the movement for a more direct and effective participation of the citizens at large in the organization of gov-

ernment, as reflected in the popular election of United States Senators and the extension of the direct primary, initiative, referendum and recall, is interestingly described in the chapter on "Democracy and Responsibility in Government," while the effects of this tendency on party organization and the growth of the Progressive Party are developed at some length in the chapter on "Political Unrest and Party Disintegration."

The achievements of the decade in the solution of the problems of the tariff, immigration, conservation and reclamation are admirably set forth in appropriate chapters. One of the most constructive measures of the period, the reformation of our banking and currency system by the creation of the Federal Reserve Banks, receives extensive treatment. Foremost among the noteworthy accomplishments of the epoch must be mentioned its labor legislation. The far-reaching social effect of the definite recognition in the Clayton Act of the principle that the status of human labor is distinct from that of commodities and articles of commerce would in itself have justified for the administration of Wilson a place in history, but the victory of labor was not limited to this recognition. For one thing the long agitated problem of injunctions in labor disputes was settled favorably to labor, and the importance of labor was recognized by the creation of a distinct Department of Labor in the Cabinet. Moreover, more adequate machinery was provided for mediation and arbitration, and the mutual interests of employers and employees in the prevention of strikes and lockouts were more clearly brought into light. In addition the cause of social legislation was greatly advanced by the wider popularity given to "Employer's Liability" and "Workman's Compensation Acts" and the principle of the eight-hour day; also by the establishment of the Children's Bureau and by the attempts made to limit and safeguard, in the interests of humanity, the labor of children and the growth of the movement for social insurance. In the chapter on "Industry and Labor" the author refers to all these questions though, perhaps, not quite so fully as their importance would seem to warrant under existing conditions. One is disappointed, however, to find no reference in this work to the Commission on Industrial Relations appointed by President Wilson of which Frank Walsh was the chairman.

No matter how we may differ in judgment on the merits of the Report of this Commission, it must be admitted that it did much to focus general attention on the living conditions of workers prevailing throughout the country and to create sentiment in favor of minimum wage legislation and more adequate protection of the worker against the hazards of industry. It would thus seem to merit some mention in the historical development of the nation's attitude toward labor.

In the latter half of his work Professor Ogg gives an excellent account of the development of the colonial policy and the foreign relations of the United States. The progress of government in the Philippines and Porto Rico; the problems met, the difficulties encountered, and the gradual extension of the principles of self-government to these dependencies, and the success achieved by the United States as a colonizing nation are all briefly outlined. The special problems of Alaska and the policies adopted by the national government to conserve and develop its rich resources also receive mention. Intervention in Cuba and the extension of the supervision and control of the United States, either direct or indirect, in Panama, Haiti, Santo Domingo and Nicaragua form the theme of a special chapter on the "Guardianship of the Caribbean," in which the author traces the formation of the policy which has guided the United States in its relations to these smaller nations. The Mexican imbroglio and the attempts of the American Government to settle the problems it presented, as might be expected, are set forth at some length. After reviewing the history of events and the efforts of President Wilson to find a solution of the troublesome difficulty, the writer expresses his judgment in the conclusion, "From its part in the tragic chapter the United States drew small satisfaction and scant credit. It incurred the suspicion or avowed enmity of all the Mexican factions. It sifted politics, and acted with no apparent po'icy, to the amazement of Americans and foreigners alike" (p. 303).

In a special chapter the author discusses our relations to China and Japan and the policy of the United States on the question of Japanese immigration. The history of the difficulties which arose over the question of the Panama Canal, its fortifications and the charging of tolls is likewise given as is the

history of our relations with the countries of South America. The concluding chapters deal with our difficulties as a neutral in the Great War, our war-time policies and our final entrance into the war on the side of the Allies. The wealth of material used by the author in the compilation of his work is revealed by the numerous references with which it abounds. The final chapter contains an excellent critical essay on authorities, in which are noted the books and official material which have a bearing on the history of the past decade. This chapter enhances greatly the value of the work for those who are interested in contemporaneous history and the present trend of our national progress.

JOSEPH A. HICKEY, O.S.A., D.D.

The Discovery of America (The Cambridge Travel Books), 1492–1584. Edited by Philip F. Alexander, M.A. Cambridge: The University Press, 1917.

The present series of travel books was projected in the spring of 1915, the object being to provide schools with a set of volumes containing original accounts of famous or interesting voyages to be read in connection with studies in history and geography. The value of such an undertaking is fairly obvious. Students of high school rank need outside reading of this sort as a complement to their ordinary class work and a stimulus to further study. And while entirely new narratives, based on sound method and possessing sufficient literary merit might go far toward satisfying such a need, nothing could more excite the interest of young persons than accounts from the pens of the great voyagers themselves. And the difficulties of such an undertaking are not so great as may at first sight appear. For, thanks to agencies like the Hakluyt Society, many such narratives are already accessible in print, while others are not so very hard to come by. And a little judicious modernizing of the spelling and some pruning here and there would suffice to render the texts intelligible and attractive. In this way a high school boy or girl would be brought into contact at an early age with the sources of historical truth and thereby accustomed to a sound method of investigation, with but slightly (if any) greater effort than is now expended on second-hand and often misleading accounts.

Such would seem to be the principles underlying the present series; and to this method it is hard to see how objection can be taken, correct as it is in theory and successful where it has already been put into practice. Everything hinges on the selection and editing of the documents and on such accidental considerations as size, binding, pictures, maps, etc. The present volume is quite small, containing slightly over two hundred pages. This is of course an advantage in a work of this class since being a "school book" it will have to be carried about a great deal. But it leaves little room for text and considering the period embraced (1492–1584) the selections are but a meagre sample of what was put forth in an age that was preëminently one of discovery and exploration. First we have the narratives of the first three voyages of Columbus, then Cartier's voyage to Canada in 1535, then that of Sir Humphrey Gilbert to Virginia in 1583, and lastly the voyage of Amadas and Barlow in 1584. From this it will be seen that only a modicum of the available material has been drawn upon and, moreover, what is presented relates in great measure to *North* America, though the title-page gives no indication of so restricted a use of the word. This latter point is not a piece of hyper-criticism, for every student of Spanish-American history will recall instances of inconvenience (not to employ a stronger term) resulting from the arrogation by one portion of the Western Continent of a designation more correctly applied to the whole, though an English writer may be pardoned an inaccuracy that has the seeming sanction of our own State Department, which refers to United States Embassies and Legations as "American." As to the somewhat small amount of matter, the Editor does not profess to give anything like a complete collection but (to quote the preface) "to illustrate the history of geographical discovery by means of select voyages and travels," so he is to be judged by the aim he has proposed to himself rather than by that which others might wish to impose upon him. And by that standard he is well entitled to the gratitude of teachers. Not only is the selection judicious but the editing is particularly happy. There is enough modernizing to make the texts intelligible and attractive without destroying their flavor. The pictures and some of the maps are from old books; and what such things lack in scientific

accuracy is more than compensated for by the aid they supply in developing the historical imagination of the young. A table of important dates in the history of discovery, from the expedition of Alexander the Great to India in 327 B. C., to the South Polar voyage of Scott in 1912, is prefixed, and at the end is a set of short but useful notes, including a glossary. If this volume be a promise of what its successors will be, the series ought to command the approval not only of those for whom it is directly intended but of more advanced students as well, for, after all, no one can ever become so "advanced" as to get beyond the use of works of this sort.

EDWIN A. RYAN, D.D.

The Political Works of James I, Reprinted from the edition of 1616 With an Introduction by Charles Howard McIlwain, Professor of History and Government in Harvard University. Harvard University Press, 1918. Pp. xvi+354.

This beautifully bound folio volume is the first of a series to be known as the *Harvard Political Classics.* Should the high standards of form and content exhibited by this first volume be maintained in subsequent issues, the student of politics and of political history, especially in the United States, will be placed under deep obligation to the editors. The considerations which have led up to the undertaking are stated in the Preface to the present volume:

> The needs of a thorough student of history can never be adequately met by mere fragments torn out of the classical writings of the past, useful though such fragments may be. For the student needs to know not alone *what* the masters thought, but also *how* they thought; and this he can never learn solely from modern histories, or even from detached bits of contemporary writings without the nexus of continuous argument by which the writers originally wove these *disjecta membra* into one whole.

The present reviewer is frank to state that his perusal of the volume before him has been a gratifying proof of the truth of the words just quoted. One gathers a much more comprehensive and concrete notion of the practical motives and considerations that impelled James I to become the extreme defender he was of absolutism and of the divine right of kings, when one reads his speeches, letters and other writings in their entirety. The con-

troversy between the King and Bellarmine is thereby placed in a much more intelligible and illuminative setting.

The long Introduction contributed by Professor McIlwain is justified by the method which he adopted with regard to the printing of the text. Instead of appending to the text of James' writings a great mass of notes and variant readings, the Editor decided to write an historical commentary and explanation which, as he modestly tells us, "the reader might read or not as he pleased."

Professor McIlwain first makes a brief review of the *Rise and Growth of the Anglican Schism*. He calls attention to the influence of politics and religion upon each other in the strife of the sixteenth century, to the effect upon Calvinists as well as upon Catholics of the claim of Henry the Eighth that he was head of the Church as well as of the State, and to the Catholic doctrine of the mutual independence of the spiritual and temporal powers, with the former superior in case of actual conflict. Cardinal Bellarmine and others taught that the authority of the monarch came to him through the consent of the people; therefore, that the monarch not only had no jurisdiction in spiritual things but that the source of his power was inferior to that of the Pope, which was conferred directly by God. Furthermore, these writers maintained that the Pope through his indirect power over civil affairs could, for spiritual ends and with the consent of the people, depose a recalcitrant monarch and set up another in his place. Professor McIlwain declares that this element of the indirect power of the Papacy, this deposing power, was defended by Bellarmine because it was necessary for the defense of the supremacy of the Papal authority in case of conflict with a monarch. This is rather too strongly put. Even today the Church rightfully claims that the laws of religion and of morality are supreme, but no Pope has in recent centuries made use of, or attempted to use, the deposing power. In Bellarmine's day it was regarded as a normal prerogative of the Pope by practically all Catholics. Professor McIlwain is of the opinion that "opposition to the Pope's indirect power made the theory of the divine right of kings the gospel of practically all English Protestants in this age." Certain it is that James made very large use of the popular prejudice against this power in his various writings in defense of his own divine right.

The unfortunate differences between the two groups of the English Catholic clergy concerning the deposing power and the Oath of Allegiance imposed by James, are briefly and, on the whole, fairly reviewed by the Editor. The Oath, he says, was "England's answer to the Jesuit challenge contained in Bellarmine's theory of the Pope's indirect power." Nevertheless, the Oath could have required Catholics to reject the deposing power (as many of them did reject it) without compelling them to denounce it as "impious, heretical and damnable." Professor McIlwain calls attention to the inconsistency of King James in maintaining that the Oath was "meerely Civill," and yet, by means of these objectionable words, "setting himself up to adjudge as heretical a doctrine believed by the majority of Catholics. Could James expect the Pope to regard the line of division between the secular and the spiritual, when he so ignores it himself?" The truth is, as Professor McIlwain intimates, that James wished to be supreme in ecclesiastical as well as in civil matters, and that e regarded the Oath as an excellent means to this end because it was calculated to divide the Catholics and therefore to weaken them. The trick was successful; for, in the words of Lingard, "the Oath effectually broke the power of the Catholic body in England, by dividing them into two parties, marshalled against each other."

The works of James, published in this volume, are: *Basilicon Doron; The Trew Law of Free Monarchies; An Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance; A Premonition to All Christian Monarchs; Free Princes and States; A Defense of the Right of Kings Against Cardinall Perron;* and five speeches, delivered between 1603 and 1616. The first of these was written to Prince Henry, his son, and sets forth in some fifty-three pages folio the duties of a king. The second treatise is devoted entirely to a defense of the proposition that the monarch receives his authority directly from God and may never be lawfully deposed. James uses three arguments: the first is from the Scriptures, the second, from the fundamental laws of the kingdom of England, and the third, from what he calls the law of nature. The Scriptural argument is based upon the words of Samuel to the people of Israel describing the authority of the king whom God would appoint to reign over them (1 Kings viii, 9-22). This, said James, is a

"paterne to all Christian and well-founded Monarchies." In other words, every king is directly appointed by God, as was Saul, and has the same unrestricted power. James bases his second argument on the contention that the first king of England (King Fergus from Ireland) overcame the barbarous inhabitants of England, and made himself their ruler and lawgiver in such fashion that he and his successors were ever afterward recognized as being absolute and above the law. Obviously all this is mere assertion. No such claim had been generally recognized by Englishmen for centuries before the days of James. His argument from the natural law consists of two similitudes: since the king is commonly compared to a father, he must have the same absolute authority over his people that a father has over his children; and, since the king is the head of his people, he must exercise the same control over them as the natural head does over the members of the body. To the objection that it is sometimes lawful for the people to overthrow a wicked and tyrannical king, he replies that the evil consequences of such action are much more grievous to the commonwealth than any amount of royal oppression. The wicked king should be left for punishment to God.

If a beginner in an elementary class of ethics or political science were to make such an argument seriously today he would be transferred to a school for backward children.

The *Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance* was written in reply to the Briefs which Pope Pius V sent to the English Catholics, forbidding them to take the Oath, and to a letter of Cardinal Bellarmine. It contains many references to the Scriptures and to the Fathers, but is fundamentally dishonest because it contends that the Oath is in no way contrary to the religious convictions of Catholics.

The Premonition was addressed to all the monarchs of Christendom, and is a pedantic and tiresome defense of the Oath, with a denunciation of the Pope and the Catholic Church. It was written as a preface to the second edition of the *Apologie*, which had been issued as a rejoinder to Bellarmine's reply to the first edition.

A Defence of the Right of Kings was a reply to an oration of Cardinal du Perron, pronounced at a meeting of the Estates

General of France in 1615. It is much the longest document in the collection, consisting, with the Preface, of exactly one hundred folio pages. The oration which it attempted to refute was the most powerful of the many statements that had been made of the Catholic position. The *Defence* uses the same arguments as the *Apologie*, but with much greater particularity, and deals in detail with the arguments of Cardinal du Perron. It displays considerable cleverness, as in the protest that the deposing power of the Pope, if allowed, might compel a son, established by the Pope in the place of his deposed heretical father, to put the latter to death.

The five speeches which form the last section of the volume are on various political and politico-ecclesiastical subjects, and are much less interesting today than the preceding productions; but the *Apologie* and the *Defence* are still of great importance to all students of those two fundamentally important subjects—the divine right of kings and the deposing power of the Papacy.

J. A. RYAN, D.D.

The Life of Abraham Lincoln. Drawn from original sources and containing many speeches and telegrams hitherto unpublished, and illustrated with many reproductions from original paintings photographs, et cetera. New Edition with New Matter. By Ida M. Tarbell. New York: The Macmillan Company, MCMXVII. Vol. i, xxxvi, +426 pp. Vol. ii, 475 pp. Price, $5 a set.

In 1894 the editors of *McClure's Magazine* conceived the happy thought of making their monthly go about our country, into cities, villages and farms, and, like a modern Ruth, collect into one treasury the things overlooked even after many a gleaning of Lincolniana. Reminiscences, pictures, documents—many sheaves of these came to the "Lincoln Bureau" that had been established in the offices of the monthly. "To facilitate the work," says Miss Tarbell, "all persons possessing or knowing of Lincoln material were asked through the Magazine to communicate with the editor. The response was immediate and amazing. Hundreds of persons from all parts of the country replied. In every case the clews thus obtained were investigated and if the matter was found to be new and useful [it] was secured. . . . The work thus became one in which the whole country cooperated."

The unpublished material thus obtained made it possible to have a series of articles on the life of Lincoln up to the year 1858 and, while throwing new light upon obscure portions of the story of Lincoln's earlier years, to correct some traditional errors and misapprehensions. Documentary evidence was unearthed establishing "clearly that his mother was not the nameless girl that she has been believed." So, too, his father "is shown to have been something more than a shiftless 'poor white,' and Lincoln's early life, if hard and crude, to have been full of honest, cheerful effort at betterment. . . . The sensational account of his running away from his own wedding, accepted generally by historians, is shown to be false." The author thinks that the most important contribution she has been enabled to make to the period of the Lincoln and Douglas Debates is the report of what is known as the "Lost Speech," which preceded the Debates by a year, it is true, but which illustrates how capable was Lincoln of grappling forensically with "the Little Giant." The reasons why the speech was "lost" and the happy occurrences that permitted it to be substantially regained and to appear, for the first time in print, in *McClure's Magazine* for September, 1896, are set forth (Vol. i, 292–299). A second series of articles completed the life, and both series, with much supplementary matter, were included in the volume-form in which the life was later issued.

The present edition is a new one, with new matter, and its price indicates the intention on the part of the publishers to make it a popular edition: "In the 17 years since the first edition of this book appeared," says the preface to the new edition, "a continuous stream of new material relating more or less directly to Abraham Lincoln has been flowing to the public," such as the *Diary of Gideon Welles*, the *Reminiscences of Carl Schurz* and the eight volumes of his public speeches, correspondence and political papers, etc., while "the collections of Lincolniana have increased not merely in size but in intelligent arrangement and selection." A new edition was clearly desirable, and the enterprise of the publishers in making its price a popular one deserves commendation. But while the indefatigable labor of the author enabled her to unearth much unpublished matter in the first instance, and later on to condense the materials furnished by other

writers since the year 1900, the method of a magazine-serial and the peculiar character of the portrait-illustrations which used to be a prominent feature of *McClure's Magazine* (the "living documents" idea) combine to give anything but a symmetrically rounded appearance to the life. The emphasis is unduly laid on the early portion of Lincoln's career, not because a proper sense of proportion should demand great emphasis there, but merely because the new material at hand was so abundant, or because previous accounts of Lincoln's life erred either by omission or by misstatement. And so we find the closely crowded and inestimably important years of his life as President taking only 262 pages (including 18 pages devoted to his funeral) for their story, while 278 pages are devoted to his life down to the year 1854—the year when he became really an interesting figure in the general history of his country. True it is that the child is father of the man, and that the unique figure of Lincoln, well-styled by James Russell Lowell "the first American," deserves to have everything we can find about his early career recorded and carefully related to his after years of public service. But the porch should not dwarf the house. Again, an Appendix to the second volume allots nearly 200 pages to a collection of his letters, telegrams and speeches, although these are not a selection intended to illustrate statements in the text (after the fashion of the *pièces justificatives* of French historians), but merely represent matter which was not included in the "Complete Works" of Lincoln edited by Nicolay and Hay or in any other collection of his writings. They do not belong to a "Life" of compass so narrow as to necessitate the exclusion of many things which an ordinary, non-scientific student of history would like to have included to make the background of Lincoln's great figure throw it into greater relief. They should rather be issued as a supplement to Nicolay and Hay's collection. We fancy that he alone who could zealously peruse such a collection would find it possible to "go through" such consecutive and fragmentary telegrams as the following (Appendix, p. 363):

War Department,
Washington City, April 28, 1863.

Hon. Simon Cameron, Harrisburg, Pa.:

Telegraph me the name of your candidate for West Point.

A. LINCOLN.

War Department,
Washington City, April 23, 1863.

Hon. S. P. Chase, Philadelphia, Pa.:
Telegraph me the name of your candidate for West Point.

A. LINCOLN.

One might argue in defense of such inclusions as these, that they exhibit the attention to detail given by the President in the midst of heartrending public duties, and illustrate, in brief, how much telegraphing he must have indulged in, as both telegrams are of even date. The contention may be correct; but the collocation or context would rather serve to illustrate just the reverse, since the two telegrams are immediately preceded by one dated April 11, 1863 (no less than twelve days earlier), and are immediately followed by one dated April 29, 1863 (six days later). Did he send only four telegrams between April 11 and April 29? Similarly, the reader would perhaps be encouraged to hunt up (vainly, nevertheless) in the text of the life the stirring events that led Lincoln to dispatch these three consecutive telegrams on August 30, 1862:

War Department,
Washington, D. C., August 30, 1862—10.20 a.m.

Colonel Haupt, Alexandria, Va.:
What news?

A. LINCOLN.

War Department,
August 30, 1862—3.50 p.m.

Colonel Haupt, Alexandria, Va.:
Please send me the latest news.

A. LINCOLN.

August 30, 1862—8.35 p.m.

Major-General Banks, Manassas Junction, Va.:
Please tell me what news.

A. LINCOLN.

Our appetite is naturally whetted by these frequent demands for news. But the next telegram is dated September 17 and is addressed to Governor Morton, Indianapolis.

In the two volumes there are fifty-five illustrations, many of them "living documents" of Lincoln, portraits taken after he had grown to the full estate of manhood (the earliest representing him at the age of thirty-nine years), and therefore not quite illustrative of the chronological growth from babyhood to mature manhood in a series of portraits so dear to *McClure's Magazine* of the old days. Then we have his portrait taken in 1858, when he was

forty-nine years old; in 1860, at the time of the Cooper Institute speech; then in the summer of 1860; another of 1860, and also a life-mask of that year; then Lincoln early in 1861, and yet another of the same year; then in 1864, and finally "the last portrait of President Lincoln," with the melancholy legend: "Taken April 9, 1865, the Sunday before His Assassination."

Miss Tarbell always writes interestingly, and there are several crises in Lincoln's career described with admirable fire and brilliancy. The dramatic touch is in evidence wherever the event justifies such a treatment. A copious Index (13 pages) closes the second volume.

H. T. HENRY, LITT.D.

Anglo-American Isthmian Diplomacy, 1815-1915. By Mary Wilhelmine Williams, Ph.D., Washington, D. C. The American Historical Association, 1916. Pp. ix+356.

The demands of American priority on this continent could be met in Central America only by the exclusion of European control, the paramountcy of United States influence, and particularly by American administration of any trans-isthmian canal. At the time the interest of this nation was awakened to Central America by our westward expansion the possibility of a Spanish challenge to the American claims had been removed by the transformation of Spain's Central American dominions into independent states. But to the United States, as formerly to Spain, the presence of the British in the isthmus presented a problem. The recent Panama Tolls dispute is the latest phase of a century-long process of adjustment; an adjustment always made more difficult by the fact that the British position was something in the nature of an accomplished fact before the emergence of any Anglo-American Isthmian question. In fact British interest in Central America antedated American independence.

In the colonial days of the Americas British encroachments had begun in Belize, the Bay Islands, and the Mosquito territory. Not only were there British settlers but the British government, in disregard of Spanish sovereignty, followed a policy which, while fluctuating, made in general for British political control. The settlement of this Anglo-Spanish question synchronized with the early years of the national life of the United States. Spanish

sovereignty was recognized in the disputed territories and the British withdrew except from Belize where they were guaranteed certain privileges in a region admittedly Spanish.

Soon afterwards Central America broke away from the Spanish empire; and when it seemed possible that the United States aspired to leadership in a Pan-American confederation the British interest in Central America led to a definite attempt to acquire territory there and to prevent any close union of the states of the isthmus. Efforts were made to enlarge the Belize settlement, to seize some of the Bay Islands, and to convert what was a settlement into a colony of the British crown. These plans were not so successful as to put the British claims beyond dispute but it was a decided gain to keep the question open. The most important British advance was the establishment of a protectorate over the Mosquito Indians who were recognized as independent by Great Britain, and whose boundaries were extended to include the place where the proposed canal would probably be made. At the same time the British intrigued to prevent American expansion in Texas and California.

When at last American attention was aroused the United States tried to counter the British policy by binding the Isthmian States together in a union that would look rather to Washington than to London, and by securing transit rights across the isthmus. Domestic politics in these states were already in confusion. And the bungling ineptitude of the British and American agents gave rise to a series of entanglements and suspicions culminating in the impasse out of which a way was sought by the Clayton-Bulwer treaty of 1850. Two questions awaited settlement, that of the canal and that of British rights in Belize and Mosquitia. But the ambiguous wording of the treaty defeated its purpose. The inter-oceanic canal was to be neutralized. The question of British rights in Central America was treated in a way that left room for future altercations. The promise of both parties not to acquire or exercise dominion in the isthmus lacked sufficient explicitness to make it something more than a merely prospective agreement. And when in the following years each government clung to its own interpretation, and Great Britain professed to believe that the treaty permitted her to make colonies of Belize and the Bay Islands the possibility of war was freely discussed. Of three

possible courses of action, war, a return to the status quo ante by an abrogation of the treaty, or arbitration, the last recommended itself to the justice and the commercial interests of England. America was also willing to arbitrate. Negotiations were begun which after several deadlocks resulted in the abandonment of all British claims in the islands and the Mosquito territory, the incorporation of these lands into Honduras and Nicaragua, and the definition of the boundaries of Belize where the recognized fact of British sovereignty was to cause no more difficulty. This territorial problem was not closed until 1894. Meanwhile, the matter of the canal was being handled satisfactorily. Very rightly the United States felt the nation had outgrown the conditions which made the old treaty stipulations for a neutral canal acceptable. At first Great Britain resisted the attempt to secure an American canal through Panama. But when the reasonableness of the American demand was recognized the Hay-Pauncefote treaty of 1901 superseded the Clayton-Bulwer agreement and permitted the construction, operation and protection of the canal by Americans. The last point in this history of Anglo-American Isthmian diplomacy is the repeal of the exemption clause in favor of American coastwise vessels which formed part of the Panama Canal Bill and against which the British government entered an effective protest.

This important chapter of American history is now told for the first time in any satisfactory and complete fashion. The work was a successful thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Leland Stanford Junior University. This and the fact that the book received the Justin Winsor prize for American history in 1914 guarantee its excellence. The work is well planned. The limits of time and idea are stated in the title. The background of Central American history is, of course, presupposed but the author gives references to help the reader fill in this background. The well-arranged bibliography is accompanied by critical comments on the value of the works listed for the present study and a liberal quotation of sources, a good map of Central America for the period of 1850–1860, and an index that leaves nothing to be desired in completeness add to the value of the book. A word of praise is merited by the writer's ability to weave innumerable details into a very readable narrative.

This study, however, is more than a careful piece of history writing. It is to be signalized as a contribution to American history. As has been said, Dr. Williams gives the first complete study of her subject. Moreover, this volume presents heretofore unused materials of value in the manuscript archives of the State Department in Washington and the Public Record Office in London. Chapters II–VIII, covering the period from 1815–1860, are notable for this reason; and of these Chapter VIII is the first good account of the actual negotiations of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty ever published. One need hardly say that these new facts collected by the author are valuable also in a reinterpretation of old ones. And even the last chapters of the book, dealing with years for which the archives are still closed, and too recent for full appreciation, are valuable by reason of the author's approach and the presentation of recent history in its proper continuity with a well explained past.

In a work of this sort there is often the danger that in focussing attention on one part of history the writer may be betrayed into coloring the general background somewhat falsely. While one might take issue with Dr. Williams on a few statements of detail it must be said that her general ideas of periods and movements are always responsive to the control of facts.

J. M. Egan, S.T.L.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

It was our good fortune in the spring of 1912 to accompany Canon Cauchie of the University of Louvain on an official mission to Spain, which had for its purpose a thorough investigation of archival material in that country for the history of the Flemish merchant houses during the reigns of Charles V and Philip II (1516-1598). The Archivo Histórico Nacional at Madrid, Simancas, the Escurial, and Seville were our chief objectives. Who could ever forget a journey to Simancas! Only a few foreign scholars were working in the Archives there when we visited that lovely little village with its huge medieval castle. There were documents everywhere—bundles (*legajos*) of them—literally, on all sides. The corridors were filled with cases; there were cases upon cases in room upon room. Luckily, we had driven out from Valladolid with Don Juan Montero, the Director; and within a short time a number of *legajos*, containing material for our search, were placed before us. At Madrid the same thing occurred. Even the stoutest-hearted worker would hesitate before attempting personal search. In Seville, the complexity of the situation was multiplied beyond all hope. Luckily, Mr. Roscoe R. Hill was then at work in the Archives, completing his *Descriptive Catalogue of the Documents relating to the History of the United States in the Papelas procedentes de Cuba deposited in the Archivo General de Indias* (Washington, 1916); and with his kindly given assistance we were enabled to orientate ourselves quickly and effectively in this vast archival field.

Personal research must of necessity be limited to a very small part of the Archives. In 1913 there were nearly 40,000 *legajos* in the *Archivo General de Indias;* and since then it is being rapidly made into a central depôt for all the intra-departmental and inter-departmental Archives. When the transfer from other Spanish Archives has been completed, there should be a total of 80,000 *legajos*. "On this basis," says Dr. Charles R. Chapman, in his *Catalogue of Materials in the Archivo General de Indias for the History of the Pacific Coast and the American Southwest* (University of California Publications in History, Vol. viii, Berkeley, California, 1919), "the ultimate wealth of the *Archivo General de Indias* is from 32,000,000 to 64,000,000 documents, aggregating 160,000,000 pages of manuscript! The vastness of these numbers and the possibilities that await the American investigator can best be appreciated when one considers that an estimate made in 1907 by a competent scholar, with the financial backing of the Carnegie Institute of Washington, revealed only 5,332 copies in the United States of documents from the Archives of Spain—not merely from the *Archivo General de Indias*—although many from the Archives at Seville have since been added to American libraries."

Dr. Chapman's volume is the latest addition to one of the most valuable series of Archival Guides in existence. We have referred on several occasions to the work carried on by the Carnegie Institution of Washington, Department

of Historical Research, under Dr. Jameson's direction, and a list of the Archival *Guides* of the Department will be found in the *Review* (Vol. i, pp. 115-116). Dr. Chapman's great work is a product of the Native Sons' Fellowship in History, at the University of California. Catholic historical scholarship in the field owes a profound debt of gratitude to Shepherd, Hill, Bolton, Priestley, Pérez, Cunningham, Robertson and Chapman.

The REVIEW has received from Archbishop Francisco Orozco y Jiménez, of Guadalajara, Mexico, a series of documents: *Colección de Documentos ecclesiasticos relacinados con los EE. Unidos*, which are being prepared for publication in these pages by Father Zephyrin Engelhardt, O. F. M., of Old Mission, Santa Barbara, California.

Among the *rarissima* of the Connolly Library of Americana is the original manuscript volume of 90 pages (small octavo) entitled: *Voiages du Rd. P. Emmanuel Crespel, Récollet dans le Canada*, written in Paderborn in 1742.

The Carnegie United Kingdom Trust is providing an endowment of £1,500 yearly for five years for the new School of Librarianship which was opened early last October by the Senate of the University of London at University College. It is under the management of a committee appointed by the Senate, containing six representatives of the University and the same number of the Library Association. The school is organized to give a professional training in librarianship, though the course will not be restricted to those intending to take up this study professionally, but will be available for all whose education is adequate. The students will have access to the courses in the Faculties of Arts and Science, and special courses will be arranged in history, literature, bibliography and book-selection, paleography and the study of archives, library organization and routine. The practical side of librarianship will receive special attention in the new school.

The Dominican College, 487 *Michigan Ave., N. E.,*
Washington, D. C., November 19, 1919.

The Reverend Peter Guilday, Ph. D.,
Dear Doctor Guilday:

It was only a few days ago that I received your queries anent the existence of an early ordinance prohibiting the erection of a Catholic church within the municipal limits of Cincinnati, and the struggles of the first Catholics in the city for their faith. That such an ordinance existed in the pioneer town and necessitated the building of the first Catholic church outside the boundary line of the city is certainly a tradition of long standing. It is also certain that anti-Catholic prejudices were strong and bitter in early Cincinnati. Until a short time ago I thought the old and oft-repeated verdict of this tradition was an admitted and unquestionable fact. But later study of the matter throws at least a very grave doubt upon the existence of such an enactment. It may well be that the tradition of the old-time prejudices added the ordinance in after

years. As you know, traditions, although they generally have some solid historic background, often become distorted. Certainly, this ordinance is not to be found among those still in existence at the City Hall, Cincinnati. However, there seems to have been then no law requiring the ordinances to be recorded, which makes it possible that this odious statute might have been enacted, but did not find a place in the records.

The earliest reference to a Catholic church (or to anything Catholic) in Cincinnati that I have been able to discover, appeared in *The Liberty Hall and Cincinnati Gazette* of December 11, 1811. This was perhaps the year of Father Edward Dominic Fenwick's first visit to the city, and the issuance of a call for the Catholics of the town to meet and deliberate on ways and means for forming a "congregation" was likely at his urging. The paper was published weekly, and the notice which we give below appeared in three consecutive issues, December 11, 18 and 25. The document seems to indicate much opposition on the part of those not of the fold.

CATHOLICK MEETING

> As the Constitution of the United States allows liberty of conscience to all men, and the propagation of religious worship, it is earnestly requested by a number of ROMAN CATHOLICKS of Cincinnati, and its vicinity, that a meeting be held on the 25th of December, next, [*sic*] at the house of Jacob Fowble, at 12 o'clock, A. M.; when, it is hoped, all those in favor of establishing a congregation and giving encouragement will attend, and give in their names, and at the same time appoint a committee of arrangements.
>
> Dec. 11, 1811.

It must be noted that the ground was actually purchased. Doubtless the bishop was led to think too that it was only rented, by the fact that the deed was not given until April 20, 1821. The delay in giving the deed was evidently because all the purchase money had not been paid.

Bishop Purcell, in a sermon preached at the laying of the corner-stone of Saint John's Church, Cincinnati, March 25, 1845, alluded to the trials and conflicts of the early Catholics in the city. In this connection he says:

> When they sought to procure a lot whereon to raise a little church, they met with contumely and reproach. They were told to go beyond the corporation line, to seek the brick yards, there they might find a place sufficiently good for them. The followers of a meek and humble Saviour, they bore all with patience and resignation. They went beyond the limits of the city, rented the small square, now known as the Old Graveyard on Vine Street, raised a small frame building, in which they devoutly assembled to adore the God of their fathers.[1]

Bishop Purcell arrived in Cincinnati, November 14, 1833, not quite fourteen years after the completion of the first Catholic church in the city. Doubtless there were living at the time of his coming some who had witnessed and even borne their part in the trials and hardships of the faithful in erecting their first temple of prayer.

[1] *The Catholic Telegraph*, April 3, 1845.

All this gives coloring to the tradition of which we have spoken. Indeed, the notice in *The Liberty Hall and Cincinnati Gazette* and the bishop's sermon may well have given rise to the tradition. Yet neither this paper nor the bishop expressly asserts, nor necessarily implies, the existence of such a prohibitory ordinance, although both indicate a bias against everything Catholic so strong as to make it imprudent to attempt to build a church within the city limits. Nor must one forget that Bishop Purcell, forceful, bold and imaginative by nature, often indulged in hyperbole for the sake of oratory and effect. This makes it necessary to take his utterances with much precaution.

While it is certain that Father Fenwick paid a number of visits to Cincinnati after 1811, we have now, owing to the loss of his letters, no record of any further efforts to build a church there from the time of the appearance of the above notice in *The Liberty Hall and Cincinnati Gazette*, until 1817. The *Western Spy*, another weekly paper of the city, contains the following notice in its issue of September 5, that year.

A CATHOLICK CHURCH

The Catholicks of the town and vicinity of Cincinnati, and those of the county of Hamilton, are requested to attend a meeting to be held at the house of Mr. Michael Scott on Walnut-street, a few doors below the Seminary, on SUNDAY, OCTOBER 12th, for the laudable purpose of consulting on the best method of erecting and establishing a Catholick church in the vicinity of Cincinnati. They will likewise please to take notice that great encouragement is already held out to them.

Looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith; who for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the Throne of God. Hebrews: Chap. 12, v, ii [The King James Version].

Cincinnati, Sept. 1st, 1817.

This meeting, there can scarcely be any doubt, was called under the inspiration of Father Fenwick. He likely presided at it. Yet, in spite of the zeal of the ardent missionary, the attendance at the meeting shows a spirit of coldness and indifference—or could it have been fear?—on the part of some of the Catholics in the city. For we are told that only "nine men, seven women and four children" came to the house of Scott at the appointed time (*Souvenir Album of the Catholic Churches in Cincinnati and Hamilton County, Ohio*, 1896, p. 11). But in May, 1818, Bishop Flaget, as we learn from his life by Spalding (p. 183), stopped at Cincinnati on a journey to Michigan. He was accompanied by Revs. Philip Janvier and John Bertrand and doubtless passed that way at the request of Father Fenwick, who was anxious to have the influence of his bishop in spurring the people on to build a temple of prayer. The attempt was successful, for arrangements were then made for the purchase of a lot with that intent.

In the meantime, one James Findlay had given to his land, just beyond the northern limits of the town, the name of "Northern Liberties," and laid it out in lots which he offered for sale. Here it was that ground was purchased for the proposed church. The name given to the new section, Northern Liber-

ties, and the fact that the early Catholics built their first temple of prayer in this locality, although it was difficult of access and far removed from their homes, seem also to have had their weight in strengthening and perpetuating the tradition of which you inquire.

Be that as it may, the Catholics now began to bestir themselves to build a church. A committee, appointed to gather funds, even wrote the following letter to John Carrere, a merchant of Baltimore.

Cincinnati, November 23rd, 1818.

Sir: Permit us to address you on a subject which we deem important.

We are authorized in behalf of ourselves and the Roman Catholicks of this town, that, considering ourselves like the lost sheep of the house of Israel, forlorn and forsaken, destitute of the means of exercising the duties of our holy religion, without guide, church or pastor, while we behold all other members of the community enjoying these benefits; we are compelled, from the paucity of our numbers, and the consequent want of pecuniary resources, to call upon our brethren throughout the Union for their assistance towards the erection of a Catholic Church.

For the speedy accomplishment of so desirable an object, we entertain a confident hope of your hearty co-operation. We, therefore, respectfully, but earnestly solicit your aid and influence.

Relying on your zeal and promptitude, we shall shortly expect to be favored with your reply directed to Mr. P. Reilly, of the firm of Perrys & Reilly, Brewers, Cincinnati. We are, sir,

Respectfully your obedient servants,

MICHAEL SCOTT, *Prest.*,
JOHN M. MAHON,
JOHN WHITE,
P. WALSH, *Secretary,*
Committee.

(*Souvenir Album*, as above, 1896, p.12).

Doubtless Fathers Fenwick and N. D. Young, the apostles of Ohio, were the leading spirits in this activity for the good of religion in Cincinnati. The latter missionary, however, seems to have been entrusted with the superintendence of work on the new church, whilst his reverend uncle gave his attention more to the other missions. Meanwhile, February 5, 1819, the Legislature of Ohio passed a law regulating the incorporation of religious societies. Probably for prudence's sake, the Catholics of Cincinnati now had their congregation incorporated in accordance with this enactment. The corporation was given the name of Christ Church, but, as may be seen from Fenwick's letters, the church was dedicated under the patronage of Saint Patrick. Doubtless it was to have the congregation incorporated that the following call for a meeting was issued, February 27 and March 6, 1819, in the *Western Spy:*

TO ROMAN CATHOLICKS

A general meeting of the Roman Catholicks of Cincinnati and the county of Hamilton is requested, at the house of John White, in Columbia-street, near Broadway, on SUNDAY, 7th of March next. . . . On business of importance.

By order of the Committee. . . . John Sherlock, *Sec'y.*
February 26, 1819.

Work on the new church now went apace. And in the *Western Spy* of March 13, 20 and 27, 1819, we read the following notice:

TO ROMAN CATHOLICKS

The Roman Catholicks of Hamilton County are requested to forward to the Treasurer, in the course of the next [? this] and the following month, as large a portion of their subscriptions as they possibly can, as the committee will thereby be enabled to have the church ready for Divine Service by next Easter Sunday.

By order of the Committee,

MICHAEL SCOTT, *Sec'ry.*
"*Cincinnati, 13th March,* 1819.

This brief document is important in that it confirms the old tradition which tells us that the first mass in Cincinnati's proto-Catholic church was said on Easter Sunday, and settles the date of the dedication of the little frame house of prayer; for in 1819 Easter Day fell on April 11. Father N. D. Young, however, as may be seen from some published interviews with him, officiated on the occasion. Tradition also tells us this. Spalding says again (*op. cit.*, p. 201) that Bishop Flaget on his return from the north, June 7, 1819, found the church under roof and in actual use. The Cincinnati directory for that year informs us that out of a population of over 9,000 there were then only about one hundred Catholics in the city.

So much for the slow growth of early Catholicity in Cincinnati, the building of the city's first Catholic church, and the arguments which, to some, seem to substantiate the tradition of an early ordinance prohibiting the erection of such a structure within the municipal limits. It is but fair to the pioneer builders of the town that I should now give the reasons which tend to show that no such statute was ever enacted.

First, as has been stated, this enactment is not to be found among the early city ordinances, a list of which is still extant and seems to be complete. Neither can any trace of the repeal of such a statute be found. The appeal for help addressed to the Catholics of Baltimore by the committee of Cincinnati makes no reference to such an ordinance. Nor does Father Fenwick, later the first bishop of Ohio, even hint at it in any of his letters still existing. Bishop Spalding, who closely follows Bishop Flaget's diary in his life of that prelate, does not speak of it, although he had every reason to do so had it been mentioned in said diary recording the episcopal visits to Cincinnati in 1818 and 1819. (See *Life of Flaget*, pp. 183 and 201). Rev. S. T. Wilson, provincial of the Dominicans, writing to Rev. John A. Hill, then at Rome, but destined soon to become one of Ohio's most efficient missionaries, speaks rather favorably of the disposition shown towards the Church by the non-Catholics of Cincinnati. This letter is dated March 6, 1820; it is in the Propaganda Archives, America Centrale, Vol. iv, No. 138. The same may be said of a letter from the Catholic committee of Cincinnati to Archbishop Maréchal, dated September 25, 1820, and published in THE CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW, Vol. iv, pp. 30-31. So

again, Rev. John B. V. De Raymaecker, O.P., who was ordained in Kentucky by Bishop Fenwick shortly after the latter's consecration, and accompanied him to Cincinnati, tells us that the non-Catholics of the city helped to defray the expenses of removing the church from the Northern Liberties into the heart of the town and constructing the new cathedral. Father De Raymaecker's statements are found in some loose notes that he left on the erection of Cincinnati into an episcopal see (Archives of the Dominican Fathers, Louvain). Some letters of the above mentioned Father Hill, found here and there, are of the same tenor as the documents from Fenwick, Wilson, and De Raymaecker.

Finally, the announcement of the bishop's arrival in his episcopal city which appeared in the *Liberty Hall and Cincinnati Gazette* of March 30, 1822, would indicate that no little harmony existed between the Catholics and those not belonging to their fold. It says:

COMMUNICATED

> We congratulate the Roman Catholicks of this city and environs on the arrival of the Right Revd. Dr. Fenwick, lately consecrated Bishop of Cincinnati and the state of Ohio. This circumstance not only interests Catholicks, but all the friends of literature and useful knowledge, as we understand that his intention is ultimately to open a school, aided by members of his Order, long distinguished for their piety and learning.

Thus, we see, none of the contemporary Catholic literature on early Catholicity in Cincinnati has a word about this traditionary ordinance. But not only is it ominously silent; its trend, in fact, is positively against the existence of such an odious statute. The same is true of all the non-Catholic histories of Cincinnati that I have been able to discover.

These facts, it seems to me, at least make the old traditional story extremely dubious, if they do not even positively refute it. A strong anti-Catholic bias among the early inhabitants of the city is admitted, I think, by all. Father Fenwick's well-known tact in dealing with those of other religious convictions doubtless toned down this bias very perceptibly, as it did wherever he labored, making his efforts in the cause of religion both smoother and more fruitful. Yet, in this connection, it should be noted that the success of Catholicity in Cincinnati and through the state of Ohio afterwards so aroused the apprehensions of sectarian ministers that they became bitter in their attacks upon the Church. It was to meet these attacks that Bishop Fenwick established the *Catholic Telegraph*, now the oldest Catholic paper in the United States.

The building of the church outside the municipal limits, and at a distance from the people, might have been a measure of economy. Perhaps, too, it was in part a precaution of the peace-loving friar, willing to make such a sacrifice further to allay the smoldering fire of bigotry. The name given to the new suburb of the city, Northern Liberties, may well have been a fancy of the man who laid it out in lots and offered them for sale. In any case, it was a catchy word for advertising purposes.

As the *Liberty Hall and Cincinnati Gazette* of March 30, 1822, states, it was Bishop Fenwick's hope and intention to start a college in his episcopal city and

to place it under the care of his Order. A seminary was also embraced in the scheme. The Dominicans of Kentucky were in hearty sympathy with both projects. Indeed, it was decided to devote their main, if not all their energies to the welfare of the Church in Ohio. Bishop Flaget, however, wrote to Cardinal Consalvi protesting against the fathers leaving Kentucky. The Cardinal, at once and without even asking for the other side of the question, decided in Doctor Flaget's favor. This precipitate action, by depriving the new diocese of the help that had been confidently expected by Bishop Fenwick, nay, promised to him, thwarted all these plans for the time being, reduced him to the greatest distress, and finally brought about his well-known visit to Rome. But prior to this he had been fortunate enough to secure the services of Revs. Anthony Ganilh and Francis V. Badin for Michigan. Badin was a younger brother of Rev. Stephen T. Badin, the celebrated missionary of Kentucky. He was in deacon's orders when he offered himself to Fenwick, and was raised to the priesthood in the little frame church that stood in the Northern Liberties. His ordination took place, Holy Saturday, April 6, 1822, being the first in the city of Cincinnati or the state of Ohio, as his brother's had been the first in the United States. The church of Saint Francis of Assisi, Vine and Liberty streets, now occupies the hallowed spot.

To give even the most succinct account of Bishop Fenwick's efforts abroad to raise means for a much-needed cathedral, college and seminary, or of his labors at home during the next few years, would run this letter into undue length. Suffice it to say that, by dint of great exertions and sacrifices that were truly edifying, the cathedral was far enough advanced to be used for divine service on Sundays in the second half of 1826. It was opened for this purpose on June 29 of that year; dedicated on Sunday, the seventeenth of the following December. A seminary was opened in the cathedral May 11, 1829, with four students of theology and six in the preparatory courses. Meanwhile, the zealous bishop struggled and stinted himself until, through the aid of the French *Association de la Propagation de la Foi* and the noted Austrian *Leopoldinen Stiftung*, he erected a new structure for a combined college and seminary. The Austrian association of charity, it may be noted here, was organized expressly for the aid of our American missions, and was, I think, largely the inspiration of Bishop Fenwick. When completed, the group of buildings was pronounced by all among the finest and most imposing in Cincinnati. So tell us the histories of Cincinnati; so speaks the picture of the institution that is still in existence. That they were substantial structures is shown by the fact that part of them remained in use for more than fifty years in the heart of an American city that takes a pride in its buildings.

From this will be seen the gross exaggeration, to say the least, in Bishop Purcell's diary which would have us believe that Cincinnati's first Catholic college and seminary were the merest botches (*The Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. v, p. 241). The diary, we are glad to see, shows the great admiration of its author for everything connected with Mount Saint Mary's, Emmitsburg, whence he was sent to Cincinnati. Yet a comparison of the pictures of the two educational institutions at that time (1833) shows that the buildings of the western establishment were far the better.

Doctor Purcell, as is well known, was somewhat susceptible to megalomania. Made a bishop at the age of three and thirty, the delusion of grandeur doubtless caused the ardent young prelate to conceive the idea of tearing down all that had been builded before, and of building everything anew on self. So he proceeds to belittle the discipline of the institution, its occupants and everything connected with it. Yet history reveals the character of the men then in the college and seminary of Cincinnati by showing their good work for the Church west of the Alleghany Mountains. Two of them, Henry D. Juncker and Josue M. Young, were afterwards appointed bishops, very likely on the nomination of Purcell himself. Besides, Fenwick's letters are proof positive of his great caution about receiving missionaries into his diocese, or students into his seminary, and the watchful eye he kept over them after they had been admitted.

Again, as is also well known, Doctor Purcell was irritable. His Diary is proof of his anger at having had to repay Bishop Rese five hundred dollars which the latter had contributed to the maintenance of the seminary during the year after Bishop Fenwick's death. The good man's wrath caused him to say all sorts of ugly, even scandalous things of its priests and seminarians. Were his assertions true, they would reflect (though no doubt this was not his intention) quite seriously on Cincinnati's first ordinary, a truly saintly and apostolic man, unless the seminary had been woefully neglected by Bishop Rese. Bishop Purcell's Diary contains no history. It is unfortunate for the reputation of its author that he left such a book of useless notes, exaggerated statements, morose reflections and unkind criticisms. It is a pity that it was ever brought to light. Three years sufficed to give the youthful prelate, that wisdom which comes from experience, and he ceased from such unwholesome musings. But, unfortunately, he forgot to destroy what he had written.

That Bishop Fenwick was held not only in the highest esteem, but in veneration, by his successor in the see of Cincinnati, is shown by Doctor Purcell's first pastoral letter and the honors paid the remains of the deceased prelate at the time of their removal from the old cathedral to the new (*Catholic Telegraph*, December 6, 1834, and March 16, 1848). It would be hard indeed to find in any language more glowing tributes paid to a man than those paid to Cincinnati's first ordinary in Doctor Purcell's pastoral. And there is every indication that they came from the heart. The same is true of the sketch of the saintly friar bishop in the *Catholic Almanac* of 1848, which many believe to have been written by his successor.

I would not have touched on the disagreeable matter of this Diary, had not one of the highest ecclesiastics in the country requested me to refute the false impressions it conveys. With this remark, I bring my letter—both too long and too dry, I fear—to a close, with the hope that it covers the points on which you seek information.

Ever cordially yours,

V. F. O'DANIEL, O. P.,

Washington, D. C.

Father Ignatius Zeller's *Conversion of Two Lutheran Ministers to the Roman Catholic Church in 1863* has recently been translated (New York, 1918: J. Schaeffer Co.), by Joseph P. Brentano.

The *Dublin Review* for July-September, 1919, contains an article by the Editor, Mr. Shane Leslie, on *Manning, America, and Democracy*. It is needless to say that one of the principal figures in the correspondence published in the article is Dr. McGlynn of New York.

The *Maine Catholic Historical Magazine* for October, 1919 (Vol. viii, No. 1.) is made up of a valuable collection of documents relative to the history of the Church in Maine. An appendix contains a list of *Bishops and Priests, now dead, who served in Maine at various epochs* (1604-1908).

Rev. John Rothensteiner begins the history of the *Northeastern part of the Diocese of St. Louis under Bishop Rosati* in the *Illinois Catholic Historical Review* for October, 1919.

Le Centénaire de l'Archévêché de Québec (1818-1919), by Monsignor Lindsay, the Archivist of the Archdiocese, which appeared in the *Semaine Réligieuse* of Quebec, is being prepared in English for the REVIEW.

The publishers, Benziger Brothers, of New York, have issued *gratis* a *List of Catholic Newspapers and Magazines published in the United States today*. The total number given is 313.

The conversion of Bishop Kinsman, of Delaware, to the Catholic Church, recalls the fact that over a half-century ago another Episcopal bishop sought and obtained admission into the Church—Levi Silliman Ives (1797-1867). Bishop Ives was one of the most distinguished converts of the Tractarian movement in America.

Among the recent acquisitions of the Connolly Library are six little pamphlets on the conversion of Father John Thayer, in 1783. He was the first native of New England to be ordained to the priesthood. Father Thayer was born at Boston in 1755, and died at Limerick, Ireland, in 1815. A graduate of Yale, he became a Congregationalist minister, and, as such, served as chaplain to the American forces around Boston. After the war he visited Europe, and was in Rome when Benedict Joseph Labre died. He was so impressed by the sanctity of Europe's "beggar-saint" that he became a Catholic on May 25, 1783. The account of his conversion, written by himself, was printed in 1787, and was re-issued in French, Spanish, and Portuguese. Finotti has listed his publications in his *Bibliographia*. The titles of these pamphlets are: *Relaçao da Conversao dor Senhor Joao Thayer, Ministro Protestante em Boston na America do Norte: escrita por elle mesmo* (Lisbon, 1788); *Rélation de la Conversion de M. Jean Thayer, etc., écrite par lui-même* (Paris, 1788); *An account of the Conversion,*

etc., (Dublin, 1809); the same, published at London, 1787; *Controversy between the Rev. John Thayer, Catholic Missionary of Boston, and the Rev. George Lesslie, Pastor of a church in Washington, New Hampshire* (Philadelphia, 1795). Father Thayer was not successful in his mission work in the United States, and he left for Europe in 1807, settling finally in Limerick. After his death, the three daughters of his host, James Ryan, came to Boston (1819), where they founded the Ursuline Convent at Mt. Benedict, Charlestown, which was destroyed by an anti-Catholic mob, August 11, 1834.

Dr. Charles H. Cunningham was appointed a Native Sons' Fellow in 1915 and spent two years in Spain, where the main center of his work was the *Archivo General de Indias*, at Seville. One of the results of his studies in Spain and at Manila was his article, *The Inquisition in the Philippines*, which was published in the REVIEW for January, 1918. The complete result of his work has recently appeared: *The Audiencia in the Spanish Colonies as illustrated by the Audiencia of Manila* (1583–1800), published (1919) as vol. ix of the University of California Publications in History. In dealing with the very delicate problem of the relation between the *Audiencia* and the Church authorities, Dr. Cunningham proves himself to be an able exponent of that splendid spirit of objectiveness and impartiality which characterizes all the work done at the University of California in the Spanish-American field.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here does not preclude extended notices in later issues of the* REVIEW)

BENEDICT, BERTRAM, A. B., Editor-in-Chief for the Bureau of National Literature. *A History of the Great War*, in two volumes. Vol. I. New York: Bureau of National Literature, 1919. Pp. 412.

BETTEN, FRANCIS S., S.J., and KAUFMANN, ALFRED, S.J. *The Modern World*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1919. Pp. 429.

BIXBY, GEORGE S. *Peter Sailly* (1754–1826): *A Pioneer of the Champlain Valley, with Extracts from his Diary and Letters*. New York State Library History Bulletin No. 12. Albany: The University of the State of New York, 1919. Pp. 94.

BLEGEN, THEODORE C. *A Report on the Public Archives*. The State Historical Society of Wisconsin. Bulletin of Information No. 94. Madison, 1918. November. Pp. 115.

CALDWELL, WALLACE E., Ph.D. *Hellenic Conceptions of Peace. Studies in History, Economics and Public Law*. Edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University, Vol. lxxxiv, No. 2. New York: Columbia University. 1919. Pp. 139.

CASTILLON, PIERRE, S. J. *Autor du Mariage. Trois Problems Moraux*. Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1918. Pp. 92.

CELARIE, HENRIETTE. *Quand "Ils" étaient à Saint-Quentin*. Paris: Bloud and Gay, 1919. Pp. 239.

CHAMBERLAIN, THOMAS G., Captain, U. S. A., A.B., J.D. *Why we Fought*. Foreword by Hon. William Howard Taft, Ex-President of the United States. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1919. Pp. ix+93.

COLE, ARTHUR CHARLES, University of Illinois. *The Era of the Civil War*, 1848–1870. The Centennial History of Illinois. Volume III. Springfield; Illinois Centennial Commission, 1919. Pp. 499.

DAWSON, WILLIAM HERBERT. *The German Empire*, 1867–1914, *and the Unity Movement*. 2 volumes. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1919. Pp. 495.

DEMEURAN, J. LOUIS, D.C.L. *L'Eglise: Constitution-Droit Public*. Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, Editor, 1914. Pp. 347.

DROULERS, ALBERT. *Sous le Poing de Fer: Quatre ans dans un Faubourg de Lille*. Paris: Bloud et Gay, Editeurs, 1919. Pp. 244.

FOX, DIXON RYAN, Ph. D. *The Decline of Aristocracy in the Politics of New York*. Studies in History, Economics and Public Law. New York: Columbia University Press, 1919. Pp. 460.

FRANCISCAN FATHERS. *Fifty-Eighth Annual Catalog of St. Joseph's Seminary*, 1918–1919. Teutopolis: Woman's Printery, 1919. Pp. 38.

GANN, THOMAS W. F. *The Maya Indians of Southern Yucatan and Northern British Honduras*. Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 64. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1918. Pp. 146.

GAY, RT. REV. CHARLES, Bishop of Athedon. Edited by Rev. J. M. Lelen. *The Happiness of Duty: A Treatise on Obedience*. Fort Thomas, Ky.: The Christian Year Publishing Co., 1919. Pp. 75.

GRISELLE, ABBÉ EUGENE. *Le Bon Combat*. Paris: MM. Bloud et Gay, 1918. Pp. 256.

HOGAN, MARTIN J., *The Shamrock Battalion of the Rainbow*. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1919. Pp. 280.

HOLLAND, BERNARD, C. B. *Memoir of Kenelm Henry Digby.* London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1919. Pp. 251.

HOLLAND, HENRY SCOTT, D.D., D. Litt. *Facts of the Faith, being a collection of Sermons not hitherto published in book form.* Edited with a Preface by Christopher Cheshire. M. A. London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1919. Pp. 294.

HUBY, JOSEPH. *La Conversion.* Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1919. Pp. 119.

HULL, ERNEST R., S.J. *That Arch-Liar Froude, and Other Curiosities Contained in the Bombay Controversy of* 1918. New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 1919. Pp. 170.

JONES, RT. REV. GUILERMO A., O.S.A., D.D. Bishop of Porto Rico. *Circular to the Venerable Clergy and Laity of His Diocese in Reference to the Message of Grand Master William F. Lippitt,* 1919. Pp. 7.

KELLOGG, VERNON. *Germany in the War and After.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1919. Pp. 101.

KIDDER, ALFRED VINCENT, and GUERNSEY, SAMUEL J. *Archeological Explorations in Northeastern Arizona,* Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 65. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1919. Pp. 228.

LEPRETON, JULES. *Le Dieu Vivant.* Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1919. Pp. 181.

LEGENDRE, MAURICE. *La Guerre et la Vie de L'Esprit.* Paris: Bloud et Gay, 1918. Pp. 256.

MCDOWELL, F. M. *The Junior College.* Bulletin, 1919, No. 35. Bureau of Education, Department of the Interior. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1919. Pp. 139.

MAHON, REV. MICHAEL P. *Ireland's Fairy Lore.* Boston: Thomas J. Flynn Company, 1919. Pp. xv+219.

M. H. D. *The Life of Denis H. Bradley, First Bishop of Manchester.* Manchester: Guidon Publishing Company. Pp. 230.

MORGAN, GEORGE. *The True La Fayette.* Philadelphia and London: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1919. Pp. 489.

NEYRON, R. P. GUSTAVE, S.J. *Le Gouvernment de L'Eglise.* Paris: G. Beauchesne, 1919. Pp. 346.

O'BRIEN, MICHAEL J. *A Hidden Phase of American History. Ireland's Part in America's Struggle for Liberty.* New York: Dodd, Meade and Company, 1919. Pp. 533.

PEASE, THEODORE CALVIN. University of Illinois. *The Frontier State,* 1818–1848. The Centennial History of Illinois. Volume II. Chicago: A. C. McClurg and Company, 1919. Pp. 475.

PHILLIPS, ULRICH BONNELL, Ph. D. *American Negro Slavery.* New York: Appleton, 1918. Pp. 529.

PIXLEY, R. B. *Wisconsin in the World War.* Milwaukee: The Wisconsin History Company, 1919. Pp. 400.

POINCARÉ, M. RAYMOND. *Messages, Discours, Allocutions, Lettres et Telegrammes. Paris: Bloud et Gay, Editeurs,* 1919. Pp. 319.

REPPLIER, AGNES. *J. William White, M. D.—A Biography.* Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1919. Pp. 283.

RHODES, JAMES FORD, LL.D., D.LITT. *History of the United States from Hayes to McKinley.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1919. Pp. 487.

SCHLESINGER, ARTHUR MEIER, Ohio State University. *Salmon Portland Chase Undergraduate and Pedagogue.* Columbus, Ohio: The F. J. Heer Printing Company, 1919. Pp. 161.

SCOTT, JAMES BROWN, *James Madison's Notes of Debates.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1918. Pp. 149.

SLOANE, WILLIAM MILLIGAN, L. H. D., LL. D. *The Powers and Aims of Western Democracy.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1919. Pp. 489.

STEINER, BERNARD C., *Life of Henry Barnard, the First United States Commissioner of Education,* 1867–1870. Bulletin No. 8, 1919. Bureau of Education, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1919. Pp. 131.

WALSH, T. J. *The Principles of Christian Apologetics.* New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1919. Pp. 175.

WILLLOUGHBY, WILLIAM FRANKLIN, Director of the Institute for Government Research. *Government organization in War Time and After. Problems of War and of Reconstruction.* With an Introduction by Frederick P. Keppel, third Assistant Secretary of War. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1919. Pp. 370.

An Educational Study of Alabama. Bureau of Education, Department of the Interior, Bulletin, 1919, No. 41. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1919. Pp. 522.

Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1916. In two Volumes. Volume I. Washington, D. C.: 1919. Pp. 507.

Committee on Special War Activities. *The Fundamentals of Citizenship.* Washington, D. C.: The National Catholic War Council, 1919. Pp. 93.

Committee on Special War Activities. *A Program for Citizenship.* Reconstruction Pamphlets, No. 5. Washington, D. C.: National Catholic War Council, 1919. Pp. 14.

Compiled by the History Circle. *British-American Discords and Concords. A Record of Three Centuries.* New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1918. The Knickerbocker Press. Pp. 85.

Department of the Interior. Bulletin 1919, No. 40. *Work of the Bureau of Education for the Natives of Alaska,* 1917–18. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1919. Pp. 77.

Howard University Catalogue, 1918–1919. Washington, D. C.: Howard University, 1919. Pp. 360.

The Movement for Statehood, 1845–1846. Publications of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin Collections. Volume XXVI; Constitutional Series Volume I. Edited by Milo M. Quaife. Published by the Society, Madison, 1918. Pp. 545.

Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society, October, 1918–June, 1919. Volume LII. Boston: Published by the Society at the charge of the Peabody Fund, 1919. Pp. 356.

Proceedings of the Society at Its Sixty-Sixth Annual Meeting. Publications of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. Madison: Published by the Society, 1918. Pp. 53.

Review of Historical Publications Relating to Canada in *The University of Toronto Studies.* Edited by George M. Wrong, M. A., H. J. Langton, M. A., and W. Stewart Wallace, M. A. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1919. Pp. 203.

St. Bonaventure's Seminary Year-Book, 1919. Edited by the Duns Scotus Theological Society. Volume III. Trenton Number. Allegany, N. Y.: Published by the Students of St. Bonaventure's Seminary. Pp. 176.

St. Joseph's Cathedral Celebration of Fiftieth Anniversary of Dedication, 1869–1919. Manchester, N. H. Pp. 42.

GENERAL INDEX
Volume V

(Book reviews are indicated by "rev")

Abel, Rev., 241, 245.
Acadians, 309.
Ackly, 254.
"Act concerning religion," 164.
Adam of Bremen (priests for Greenland), 181–182.
Adams, President, and the "Alien law," 379.
Aftermath of the Civil War, in Arkansas, The, by Powell Clayton, Governor of Arkansas, 1861–1871, rev., 100–102.
Albany, Catholic church in, 305.
Alberni, Gov., and Lasuen, 146.
Albornoz, Card. (Shea's publication on), 283.
Alegre, 352–376 *passim*.
Alemany (Archbp.), Joseph Sadoc, 18; *See* Bibl., 122.
Alexander VI (1492), 189.
Alexander III, 231.
Alexander VI, 7, 193.
Alexander, P. F., *The Discovery of America*, rev., 413–415.
Alf, bp. of Gardar, 188, 190.
Altamira y Crevea, Rafael, *Historia de Espana y de la Civilizacion Espanola*, 109.
Althing (folk-moot), 177, 185, 186, 187.
Alvord, [Clarence Walworth], and John Edgar, 203; de St. Pierre's letter, 207n.
Allwill (sem.), 244, 245.
Amadas, 212.
Amat, Bp. Thaddeus, *See* bilb., 122–123.
Am. Cath. Hist. Soc. *Records, A Legend of the Dying Girard*, 289; *Mother Mary Patricia Waldron*, 289.
Amurrio, Gregores, 138.
Ancient Order of Hibernians, and Bp. McQuaid, 331.
Anglo-American Isthmian Diplomacy, by W. Williams, rev., 423–426.
Anti-Catholic ordinance of Cincinnati, arguments against existence of, 428–435.
Antonelli, Card., letter (faculties) to Carroll, 202; Carroll's letter (about de St. Pierre) to, 195; 394–396.
A. P. A., The, and McQuaid, 345.
Aranzibia, Jose Ignacio, 14.
Archangeli, Fr., 399.
Archives: Balto. Cathed., 42, 52, 53, 54; Cal., 149; Cath., of Am., Notre Dame, Ind., 213; Madrid, Hist. Nac., 427; Newark, 45; N. Y. Arch., 48, 50, 51; Office, N. Y. C., 44; Santa Barbara, 66, 135, 149, 153; St. Genevieve, 216, 217, 218, 220; Seville, 427–430.
Archivo Historico Nacional, at Madrid, 427.
Are, the priest, 175.
Arizona, N. M. and, sketch of diocesan history of, 5–11.
Arne, bp. of Bergen, 177, 180; bp. of Gardar, 187, 188.
Arnold, bp. of Gardar, 185.
Arrilaga, Lasuen and, 146.
Asser, Archbp., 185.
Aubuchon, Augustine, 220.
Auburn, trouble in Church there, and McQuaid, 311.
Axton, Maj., synopsis of War Department's plan for a *History of the U. S. Army Chaplains*, 119.

Bacon, Bp. David William, *See* bibl., 128.
Badin, Very Rev. (?St.) Th., 256.
Baltes, Bp. Peter Joseph, *See* bibl., 123.
Baltimore, bp. of (Mier), 14.
Bancroft, Hubert Howe, and Lasuen, 136, 154–155; on Kino, 373.
Baraga, Bp. Frederick, *See* bibl., 123–124.
Barda, de la, 68.
Bardstown, in 1819, 305–306.
Barron, Bp. Edward, *See* bibl., 124.
Barry, Bp. John, *See* bibl., 124.
Basilikon Doron (JamesI), 417.
Bayley (Mother Seton) Elizabeth Ann, 222–238.
Bayley, Archbp. James Roosevelt, *See* bibl., 124–125; and Bp. McQuaid, 42-54 *passim*; *Memoirs of Bishop Bruté*, 282.
Bayley, Dr. Richard, 231n., 232–233.
Bazin, Bp. John Stephen, *See* bibl., 125.
Beauvais, Mdme., 217.
Beauvais, Vital, 217.
Becker, Bp. Thomas Andrew, *See* bibl., 125.
Bellarmine, and James I, 415–418.
Benavidas, Fray Alonso de, 24.
Benevolent Soc. (Cinn.), 243, 254.
Bennett, Dr. John Cook, and Bp. Purcell, 246, 247.
Bentivoglio, 68.
Bernard, Fr., de St. Pierre's letter to (tithes), 218.
Berthold, bp. of Gardar, 191–192.
Bertrand of Ortolis, 183.
Bibliography, *Guide to Biographical*

Sources of the American Hierarchy, 120–128, 290–296.
Bido, Francisco, 40, 41.
Björnn, the Jerusalem farer, 188–189.
Blaa (O. P.), Bp. Jacob, of Gardar, 193.
Blanc, Archbp. Anthony, *See* bib., 125; church in Texas, 15; letters to Rosati (de St. Pierre), 221–222, 250.
Blanche, Queen, 180.
Blanchet, Bp. Augustin Magliori Alexander, *See* bibl., 125.
Blanchet, Archbp. Francis Norbert, *See* bibl., 126.
Blenk, Archbp. James, *See* bibl. 126.
Blesington, Lady, 249.
Bohemia Manor, mission of, neglected graves of Jesuit fathers at, 287–289.
Boisbriant, Pierre Duguet de, 209.
Bolant (or Volant), Bp. Gobelinus, of Gardar, 192.
Bolduc, 218.
Bolton, Herbert Eugene, Ph.D., 19n–38n *passim*; *Kino's Historical Memoirs of Pimeria Alta*, rev., 353–376.
Bonacum, Bp. Thomas, *See* bibl., 126.
Bonaventure (Mr.), 219.
Boniface IX (Tithes), 183.
Book of the High Romance—a Spiritual Autobiography, The, rev., 99.
Books received, 129, 297.
Books reviewed, 91–113, 257–281.
Borgess, Bp. Caspar Henry, *See* bibl., 126.
Boria, Gov., and Lasuen, 146-150.
Bossuet, Bp., and historiography, 66.
Boston, Archdcsn. bibl. Cheverus material, *See* bibl., 292–293.
Boston, Catholic churches in, 305.
Bourgade, Archbp. Peter, *See* bibl., 126–127.
Boyle, Mother Elizabeth, Bp. McQuaid and, 44, 50.
Brackenridge, Henry, and de St. Pierre, 216–217.
Bradley, Bp. Denis Mary, *See* bibl., 127.
Brady, Bp. John, *See* bibl., 127.
Brakspeare, Card. (Albano), 185.
Brennan, Bp. Thomas Francis, *See* bibl., 127.
Brent, Robert, 289.
Briand, Bp., and Fr. Forget, 208.
Brondel, Bp. John Baptist, *See* bibl., 127.
Brooke, Robert, 168.
Brossart, D. D., Rt. Rev. Ferdinand (pastoral on eduction), 286–287.
Bruté de Rémur, Bp. Simon William Gabriel, *See* bibl. 127–128, 236–253 *passim*; *Catholic America*, 282.
Buenaventura, Fray Juan de, 22.
Bullock (Mr.), and Bp. Purcell, 249, 254.
Burke, Bp. Thomas, M. A., *See* bibl., 128.
Bury, John Bagnell, 131–132.
Butler (Pres. Mt. St. Mary's), 251, 252.
Butler, Bp. Thaddeus, *See* bibl., 128.
Byrne, Bp. Andrew, *See* bibl., 128.

Cabrillo, 15.
Cahokia, 407.
California, sketch of diocesan history of, 15–18.
Calvert, Cecilius, 158, 160, 168, 171.
Calvert, George, 156, 161, 168.
Calvert, Leonard, 156, 163, 166, 167, 171.
Calvo, Jose Joaquin, 56.
Campbell, Col. B. U., 283.
Campbell (S. J.), Rev. Thomas J., 352–376.
Carey, Mathew, 378.
Carmelite (Paul de St. Pierre), 185–222.
Carmelites (Port Tobacco), 308.
Carnegie *Guides*, 427–428.
Carnegie, United Kingdom Trust, 428.
Carroll, Charles (founder of Rochester), 42.
Carroll of Carrollton, Charles, estates of family scandals, 239, 252; *Life of Charles Carroll of Carrollton*, by Lewis A. Leonard, rev., 102–104.
Carroll, Daniel, 289.
Carroll, Archbp. John, *See* bibl., 290–291; correspondence with Bp. Hubert, Fr. Gibault (diocesan boundaries, de St. Pierre, 195–203; de St. Pierre and, 219–220; and Mother Seton, 231, 243, 287, 289, 394.
Casa Grande, 366.
Cassily, M. P., Bp. Purcell and, 243–244, 249–250, 254, 255.
Castelnau, 66.
Catholic University of America and McQuaid, 328.
Caton (Mr.), 239.
Cauchie, Alfred, Canon, 427.
Cellini, Rev. Francis, and de St. Pierre, 221.
Chabrat, Bp. Guy Ignatius, *See* bibl., 291.
Challoner, Bp., and jurisdiction in America, 383–384.
Chanche, Bp. John J., *See* bibl., 291–292.
Chapelle, Archbp. Placide Louis, *See* bibl., 291–292.
Chapman, Ph.D., Charles E., *A Great Franciscan in California: Fermin Francisco de Lasuen*, 131–155; *A history of Spain. Founded on the Historia de Espana y de la cirilizacion Espanola of Rafael Altamira*, rev., 109–113, 427.
Charlton, Richard, 231.
Chase (lawyer), 255.
Chatard, Bp. Francis Silas, *See* bibl., 292.
Cheverus, Card. John-Louis Lefebvre. *See* bibl., 292–293; and Mother Seton, 223–238 *passim*.

Choiseul, Marquis de, 398.
Church in North America (Greenland) in the Middle Ages, The—conditions of existence in colony, difficulties of communication with, government hierarchy, 175–194.
Church and state in Spanish America, relationship of, 140–142.
Cicero, 68.
Cirillo, Bp., de St. Pierre's letter to, 213–214.
Clancy, Bp. William, *See* bibl., 294.
Clark, 212.
Clavigero, 374.
Clayborne, William, 165, 166.
Clayton, Powell, *The Aftermath of the Civil War, in Arkansas*, rev., 100–102.
Clement VII, 3, 191.
Clifford, Lord, 249.
Collell, Francois, 219.
Collins, Rev. E., 247, 248, 252.
Colodro, Juan Belarde, 40, 41.
Colonial Virginia, its People and Customs, by Mary Newton Stanard, rev., 261–263.
Colton, Bp. Charles Henry, *See* bibl., 294.
Commines, 68.
Conaty, Bp. Thomas, *See* bibl., 294.
Concanen, Bp. Richard Luke, *See* bibl., 294.
Conlan, Rev., 244, 245, 251.
Connolly (O.P.), Bp. John, *See* bibl., 294, 304.
Conroy, Bp. John Joseph, *See* bibl., 294.
Conwell, Bp. Henry, 14; *See* bibl., 295.
Cooper, S., baptism of, 237.
Copart, Fr., companion of Kino, 361.
Cornwallis, Thomas, and Cuthbert Fenwick, 161–163, 165–166, 168.
Corrigan, Archbp. Michael Augustine, and Bp. McQuaid, 45–46, 48, 50–51, 312–320; and Shea, 283; *See* bibl., 295.
Cosgrove, Bp. Henry, *See* bibl. 295.
Cotter, Bp. Joseph Bernard, *See* bibl., 295.
Coyteux, Louis, and de St. Pierre, 217–218.
Councils: Lyons (tithes in Greenland), 182–183; question of fourth plenary, in U. S., 115–118; Third Plenary, Balto., 324–326; Vatican, 43, Bp. McQuaid at, 312–316.
Cousinne (S.J.), Rev. Michael James, 288, 289.
Crespel (O.F.M.), Fr. Emmanuel, 428.
Crespo, Bp. Benito, Franciscans and, visitations of, 6–7, 11.
Crétin, Bp. Joseph, *See* bibl., 295–296.
Crowley, Rev. Charles A., and Bohemia Manor, *Registers* of old mission, 287.
Cruzat (Mr.), 213.
Culemans, Ph.D., Rev. J. B., 409.
Cunningham, Charles W., 437.
Cunningham, Bp. John Francis, *See* bibl., 296.
Currier, Bp. Charles Warren, *See* bibl., 296.
Cuthbert Fenwick—Pioneer Catholic and Legislator of Maryland, 156–174; adventurer and redemptioner, lineage of, 156–161; association with Cornwallis, 161–171; importance of, in colony, 158–168, 171, 174; descendants, 168–173 *passim;* "Puritans' oath," 164; will of, 168–169, 169–170; will of Mrs. (Jane Eltonhead) Fenwick, 170.

Dahmen, Fr., 215.
Darboy Archbp. (Paris), 314.
Darras *General History of the Church*, Dr. White's appendix to English translation of . . . *Catholic Church in the U. S.*, 283.
Daugherty (Sem.), 242.
David, Bp., 240, 241.
Davila, 68.
Davis, Bp., 306.
Davis, George L., and Fenwick, 158–159, 164, 172–173.
DeAndreis (C.M.), Fr. Felix, 306.
De Barbery, 228, 229, 230.
De Bibra, 198.
De Courcy de la Roche Heron, Henry, and eccles. hist. of U. S., 283.
De Esebeck, 198.
Delannoy, *L'Université de Louvain* . . . , 286.
Delassus (Mr.), 219.
De Limpach, Bernard, 196, 197; de St. Pierre and, 205, 207, 214, 215.
De Ludwig, 198.
De Luynes, Rev., 241.
Desmoulins, Fr., at Kaskasia, 403.
De Moys (O.F.M.), John Erler, bp. of Gardar, 192.
Deux Ponts, Duke Christina de, 198.
Deux Ponts, Reg. de Roy., officers of, 198.
Deux Ponts, Viscount de, 198.
Dwenger, Bp., and McQuaid, 337–342.
Devitt (S.J.), Fr., letter (names of Jesuits buried at Bohemia Manor), 287–288.
Diary, Bp. Purcell's, 432–435.
Didier, Pierre Joseph, 219.
Dillon (sem.), 244, 245.
Discovery of America, The, by P. F. Alexander, rev., 413–415.
Doane (chap.), Rev. George H., 52.
Documents: *An Historical . . . Description of California*, by Don Pedro Fages. (Translated [and introduction to] by Herbert I. Priestley, Ph.D.), 71–90; Bp. Purcell's *Journal*, 230–250.

Dodge, John, 203–204.
Dominicans, 135, 137.
Dorsey (Catholic), and graves at Bohemia Manor, 287.
Drake, Dr., 241.
Driscoll, F., 256.
Duane, William, 378.
Dublin Press, 378.
Dubois, Bp., 239; Purcell and pastoral of, 251, 309.
Du Bourg, Bp., and de St. Pierre, 221, 306.
Dubuque, Augustine, 208, 211.

Early, Very Rev. James M., 53, 54.
Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction in the Spanish Colonies, 3–18; Arizona (Pimeria Alta), 11; California, early conditions, effects of transfer to U. S., 17; Picpus fathers and, 17–18; Monterey, 18; Church and state, cooperation of, 4; Durango, Bp. Crespo and, difficulties with Franciscans, stipend regulations, 6–7; Guadalajara, Franciscans in, Indian Uprising, 4–6; Elizacochea, Bp. Martin de, 7–8; Iturbide, 9; Mexico, troubled conditions, civil and ecclesiastical, 8–9; Rascon, Dr., 9–10; San Vicente, 9; table of diocesan development, 4; Tagle, Bp. de, 8; Tamaron y Romezal, Bp., and Franciscans, 8; Texas, difficulties of administration, 12; visitation of Bp. Tyada, 12–13; Servando Mier and, 13–14; Vic.-Apost. established, 14–15; Zubiria y Escalante, Bp., Fr. John Lamy and, 10–11.
Edgar, John, and de St. Pierre, 197, 203–204.
Education, Bp. Brossart's *Pastoral*, 286–287.
Edues, Indians, 360.
Edwards, Martha L., *Religious Forces in the United States*, 289.
Egan, S.T.L., Rev. J. M., 426.
Elder, Basil, 240.
Elder, Francis, 239, 240.
Elder, Joseph, 250.
Eltonhead-Moryson-Fenwick, Jane, 169, 170, 171.
Eltonhead, Richard, 169.
Eltonhead, William, 169.
Emmet, Thomas Addis, 378.
Engelhardt (O.F.M.), Fr. Zephyrin, *Interrogatorio y respuestas of Fr. José Señan, August* 11, 1815, 55–66, 428.
England, Bp., and Bp. Purcell, 239, 301.
Epinetti (S.J.), Peter, 289.
Eric, Bishop, 184.
Eric, the Red, colonies, conversion of, 175, 177.
Escobar's Relation of the Oñate Expedition to California, 19–41; discovery of diary, sketch of Oñate's previous activities, 19–23; description of country, customs, 23–41.
Escurial, 427.
Eskil, bp. of Gardar, 192.
Espejo, 21, 22, 26.
Eystein, Archbp., 185.

Fallon (O.S.F.), 388.
Faribault system, 346.
Faris, John T., *The Romance of Old Philadelphia*, rev., 257–261.
Farfan, Marcos, 20, 21, 22.
Farmer (Steinmeyer), Fr. Ferdinand, Vic.-Gen., letter to Dr. Carroll about de St. Pierre, 195–196.
Faure, Rev. Stephen, 288, 289.
Fenwick (S.J.), Benedict J., 173.
Fenwick, Cuthbert, 156–174; 169, 170, 171.
Fenwick (O.P.), Rt. Rev. Edward Dominic, 173, 240, 245, 253, 307; and church in Cinn., 429–432; 307.
Fenwick, Enoch, 173.
Fenwick, Francis, 160.
Fenwick, George, 160.
Fenwick (S.J.), George, 173.
Fenwick, Ignatius, 169, 170, 171, 172.
Fenwick, Jane (Eltonhead-Moryson), 169, 170, 171.
Fenwick, John, 169, 170.
Fenwick (O.P.), John C., 173.
Fenwick, Richard, 169, 170.
Fenwick, Robert, 170, 171.
Fenwick, Teresa, 169, 170, 171.
Fenwick, Thomas, 169.
Fernandinos (O.F.M.), 132–150 *passim*.
Filicchi, Amabilia and Antonio, Mother Seton and 224–238 *passim*.
Finley, Gov., 251.
Fisher, Rev. Daniel, 46.
Fitzherbert, Fr., 170.
Flaget, Bp., 240, 301, 430.
Fleet, Capt. Henry, 165.
Floriant, 247.
Flynn, Dean, Bp. McQuaid's letter to, 45.
Forbach, Count de, 198.
Forget du Verger, Fr., and mission property, de St. Pierre's recovery of, 208–211.
Foix (C.S.C.), Rev. Dr. Paul J., 377.
Franciscan in California: Fermin Francisco de Lasuen, a Great, 131-155; economic development of missions under, 145–146; president, power of, 139–144 *passim;* protest against Neve plan, 147–148, 149, 150; refutation of charges against, 148, 149; Serra and, 131–133, 137, 142, 144; tactfulness of, 142–155 *passim;* work of Lasuen and Serra, 154–155.

Franciscan Sisters, and histories of the U. S., 284.
Franciscans, in Spanish colonies, 2–9, 12–17 *passim*.
Frederick, the Saxon, 176, 184.
Friends of Mary (Loretto), 308.
Frontier States, The, by T. C. Pease, rev., 402–409.
Fry, Joseph, 243, 254.
Fueter, and historiography, 285.

Ganith, Rev. Anthony and will of Bp. Flaget, 240–241, 245, 255.
Gabriels, D.D., Rt. Rev., *Le Catholicisme aux Etats-Unis durant le XIX^e siècle*, 115.
Gadsden Purchase, 11.
Galindo, Bp. Felipe, 12.
Gallagher, Philip, 256.
Gallitzin (Fr. Smith), Prince, 196.
Galvez, José de, and Lasuen, 133–135, 140.
Gano, Dr., 249–253 *passim*.
Garcés, Bp. Julian, 3.
George, bp. of Gardar, 191.
Georgia, Cath. churches in, 304.
Georgetown College, foundation of, 309; Grassi (S.J.) and 302.
German Catholics in Illinois, 408.
Geschiedenis van het Amerikannsche Volk, by Arthur Meyer, rev. 264–265.
Gibault, Fr., 214, 215; Bp. Carroll, 200, 201, 202; and Clark, 212–213; and de St. Pierre, 197–210 *passim*.
Gibson, Capt., 186.
Gilbert, Sir Humphrey, 414.
Gilmour, Bp., and McQuaid, 332.
Gobelinus Bolant (or Volant), (O.S.A.), bp. of Gardar, 192.
Grammar of English Heraldry, by W. H. St. John Hope, rev., 95–97.
Grassi (S.J.), Fr. John, 301–310.
Great Franciscan in California: Fermin Francisco de Lasuen, 131–155.
Greaton (S.J.), Fr. Joseph, 287, 288, 289.
Greenland, *See Church in North America*, 175–194.
Gregory IX (decision on substitutes for bread and wine), 181.
Gregory XVI, 10, 15, 16.
Gregory, bp. of Gardar, 193.
Gregory, bp. of Tours, and *pain bénit*, 212.
Gross, John, 242.
Grotius, 68.
Gruber (S.J.), Fr.-Gen., and Grassi, 302.
Guaicuros, Indians, 358.
Guano, Martin Lopez de, 40, 41.
Guicciardini, 68.
Guide to the Materials for American History in the Westminster Diocesan Archives, 382–401.
Guignes, Fr. Louis, 204, 213, 215.
Guilday, Ph.D., Rev. Peter, *Bibliography: Guide to the Biographical Sources of the American Hierarchy*, 120–128, 290–296; *Guide to the Materials for American history in the Westminster Diocesan Archives*, 382–401.
Guise, 68.

Hakluyt Society, 413.
Hassett, Rev. Thomas, 221.
Haugh (S.J.), Rev. Daniel F., 287.
Haydcn, Rev., and Mt. St. Mary's, 239.
Heath, Archibald, 289.
Heath, James, 289.
Heath, Richard, 289.
Heimbucher, 284.
Henry IV, 68.
Henry, LL.D., Rt. Rev. Hugh T., *A Legend of the Dying Girard*, 289; 423.
Hermange, Dr. Auth., 243, 249, 250.
Heuser, H. J., *Mother Patricia Waldron*, 289.
Hickey, Rev., 239.
Hickey, (O.S.A.), D. D., Rev. Joseph A., 413.
Hidalgo, Guadalupe, 10.
Hierarchy, American, *See* bibl., 122–128, 290–296; in early Greenland, 178–193 *passim*.
Hilarius (Cap.), Fr., 215.
Hill, Roscoe R., 427.
Historic Mackinac. The historical, picturesque, and legendary features of the Mackinac country, by Edward Wood, LL.D., rev., 275–281.
History of the United States since the Civil War, by Ellis Paxson Oberholtzer, rev., 91–95.
History of Spain, A. Founded on the Historia de Espana y de la civilizacion Espanola of Rafael Altamira, by Charles E. Chapman, Ph.D., rev., 109–113.
History of the United States Army Chaplains, A., War Dept.'s plans for, 119.
Hobart, Mr., and Mother Seton, 233.
Hodgson (S.J.), Rev. Thomas, 287, 288, 289.
Hogan schism, 14.
Hollis, Capt. John, 165.
Holweck, Rev. F. G., 221.
Homer, 68.
Hope, W. H. St. John, *A Grammar of English heraldry*, rev., 95–97.
Horsey, Lee, 255.
Howard, Rev. Maurice, 256.
Hubert, bp. of Quebec, and diocesan boundaries, Dr. Carroll and, Fr. Gibault and, de St. Pierre and, 195-211 *passim*.
Hughes, Bp., 44, 45.
Hughes (S.J.), Rev. Thomas (Jesuits buried at Bohemia Manor), 288.

Hunter (S.J.), Fr., 287.
Huonder (S.J.), 303.
Hurley (O.S.A.), Rev. M., baptism of S. Cooper, 237.

Indians: Ahalcos Macha, 37; Amacava, 27–38 *passim;* Apache (Vaquero), 20; Bahacecha, 29–31, 32, 33; Cruzados (Yavapai) 39; Esmalcatatanaaha, 37; Edues, 360; Guaicuros, 258; Huallapais, 29; Jumano, 20, 21; Medara Qualchoquato, 37; Mequetata, 37; Mohave, 29; Niequetata, 37; Osera, 32; Ozaras, 35; Pueblo, 20; Quigjumas, 33; Quiviras, 22; Tacabuy, 39; Tascana Paycos Macha, 37; Tepeguanes, 32; Theguas, 39; Vacecha, 35–36; Yuman, 33; Zamocha Huicha, 37; Zinoes (Hamacha Coemacha ? Fish), 37.
Indians, at California missions, 135–136; San Diego revolt, 138–139.
Infallibility, at Vatican council, 314-320.
Ingle, Richard, 166.
Innocent VIII, 193.
Instruction on school question, 320–327.
Interrogatorio y respuestas of Fr. José Señan, August 11, 1815 comprehensive report of conditions, customs, etc., at Cal. missions, 55–66.
Ireland, Archbp., and McQuaid, 344–348.
Islaf, bp. of Skalholt (Iceland), 184.
Italians, in U. S., 330–332.
Iturbide, 9.
Ivar Bardsson, 178, 183, 190.
Ives, Levi Silliman, 436.

Jacob, bp. of Bergen, 183.
Jacquot, 243.
James I, Political Works of, by C. H. McIlwain, rev., 415-419.
Jameson, Dr. J. Franklin, 428.
Jamison, Rev. (Pres. Mt. St. Mary's), 239, 251.
Janin, Rev., Pierre, 219.
Janvier, Rev. Philip, 480.
Jesuit work on the writing and judging of history, An early, by . . . Fr. LeMoyne, 66-70.
Jesuits, and Fenwick family, in Maryland, 168; in the U. S. (1819), 307-309; transfer of Cal. missions, 133, 135, 140.
Jesuits in the United States (1819) 307-309.
Johann, de, 198.
John, bp. of Gardar, 185.
John II, of Gardar, 185–186.
John XXIII (Bologna), 192.
John Knut, bp. of Gardar, 185.
Jonsson, Finnur, 184.
Journalism, Irish-Cath., in America, 377–381.
Juncker (Rev.), Henry D., 244, 245, 250–253 *passim.*

Kalb, de, 198.
Kampe, Vincentius Petersson, bp. of Gardar, 193.
Kaskaskia, in 1786; de St. Pierre and politicians, 197, 203–204, 218–220; Jesuits and, 210, 406–407.
Kavanagh, Rev. Martin, 311.
Kenrick, Rt. Rev., 239.
Kentucky, Dominicans in, 306–308.
Kilroy, Dr., appreciation of Bp. McQuaid, 52.
King, Rufus, 380.
King's Mirror, 180–181.
Kino's historical memoir of Pimeria Alta, by Herbert E. Bolton, Ph.D., rev. (T. J. Campbell), 352–376.
Kinsman, Bp., conversion of, 436.
Knut, Bp. John, of Gardar, 185.
Knutsson (O.S.B.), Bp. Matthias, of Gardar, 193.
Koch, T. W., *The University of Louvain and its Library,* 280.
Kohlman, Rev. Paul, 239.
Kohlmann (S.J.), 301.
Kraemer, Rev., 256.
Kroeber, Prof. A. L., 55.

La Buxiere, 208.
Lachance, Nicholas Caillot, de St. Pierre and, 203–204, 216.
Lambert, Fr., and McQuaid, 334–345.
Lamy, Fr. John, Vic.-Apost., 11.
Lancaster (S.J.), prefect, attempt of boys to mob, 240.
Langlois, Pierre, 215.
Langton, 246.
La Paz, 358.
Laperousse, Lasuen and, 150–151.
Larson, Ph.D., Laurence M., *The Church in North America (Greenland) in the Middle Ages,* 175–193.
La Salle, 12.
Lasuen . . . Fermin Francisco de, 131–155.
La Valiniere, de St. Pierre and, 205–208, 218–219.
Law, John, and German settlers, 205n.
Lazarist, 222.
Ledochowski, Card., and McQuaid, 344.
Lembec, Peter, 386.
Le Moyne (S.J.), Pierre, 67–70.
Leo X, 7.
Leo XII, 16.
Leonard, Lewis A., *Life of Charles Carroll of Carrollton,* rev., 102–104.
Leslie, Shane, 436.
Liberty Hall and Cincinnati Gazette, 430.
Librarianship, new school of, 428.

Life of Abraham Lincoln, by Ida M. Tarbell, rev., 419–423.
Lilienstein, Ruhle de, 198.
Lincoln, Life of, rev., 419–423.
Lincoln, Uncollected letters of . . ., rev., 97–99.
Lister, Sir Robert, 379.
Livy, 68.
London Emigration Soc., 408.
Loughlin, Sir James, 399.
Louis XIII, 68.
Louisiana Purchase, Catholics in, 305.
Louvain University, recent publications on, 286.
Lovejoy, Elijah Parish, 405.
Lower Cal., settlement of, 355–376.
Lucian, 68, 70n.
Lutkins, Stephen H., 43.

McCann, Sr. M. A., and Mother Seton, 223, 239.
McCloskey, Most Rev. [John Card.], and McQuaid, 42, 322–325.
McCloskey, Bp. (Louisville), 381.
McDonald, Very Rev. W., 255.
McElroy, Rev., 240.
McGuire, John (trustee of Utica church), 42.
McHenry (Mr.), 249, 252.
McKenna, Rev. Joseph, 53.
McMechan, Dr. John, 256.
McNeal, John, 242.
McNeven, W. J., 381.
McNulty, Rev. William, address to Bp. McQuaid, 54.
McQuaid of Rochester. His pastoral work in New Jersey (1848–1868), 42–54; *. . . His Episcopal Career* (1868–1902), 311–352.
McTavish, Mr., 239.
Madden, Rev. Michael, 45.
Maffeus (S.J.), 68.
Magnus, King, 180, 190.
Maine, Cath. hurches in, 305.
Malaspina, Lasuen and, 153.
Malevé (S.J.), 304.
Malone, 344.
Manners (S.J.), (Sittensperger), Fr. Matthias, 196, 287, 289.
Marèchal, 301.
Mariana (S.J.), 68.
Marquez, Geronimo, 28.
Marshall, Dr., 248.
Martinez, Fray Alonso, 20.
Maryland, Catholic churches in, 304.
Matthews, Thomas, *Puritans' Oath*, 164.
Matthias, bp. of Gardar, 189.
Maturna, Melchor de, 41.
Maxwell, Fr. Jacques (Vic.-Gen.), 219, 220.
Meline, Fr., 246, 247.
Mellard, 248.
Meurin (S.J.), Fr. Sebastian Louis, 215.
Mexico, beginning of diocesan history of, 2–3.
Meyer, Arthur, *De Geschiedenis van het Amerikansche Volk*, rev., 214–215.
Michael (Nicholas), bp. of Gardar, 192.
Michaud, Rev. (de St. Pierre's successor at Iberville), 222.
Mier, Servando, ("Bp. of Balto."), 14.
Mina, Gen., 14.
Miscellany: *An early Jesuit work on the writing and judging of history* (LeMoyne's). Summary of work by Leo F. Stock, 67–70; *Interrogatorio y respuestas of Fr. José Señan, August* 11, 1815. Contributed by Fr. Zephyrin Engelhardt (O.F.M.), 55–66.
Missions: Cal., 131–155 *passim*.
Molyneux (S.J.), Fr., 287
Monrroy, Alferez Pedro Sanchez, 40.
"Montana" letters, 378
Montero, Don Juan, 427.
Montezuma, 367.
Montluc, 68.
Moore, William H., *The Clash, a Study in Nationalities*, 286.
Moran, Fr. [Patrick], 46, 52.
Moreau, *La Bibliothèque de l'Université de Louvain*, 1636–1914, 286.
Moreland, 254.
Moreno, Fr., 11.
Moreno, Bp. Francisco Garcia Diego, 16–17.
Morinie (S.J.), Fr. John, 215.
Morrogh, Albert, 399.
Mt. St. Mary's, Emmitsburg, 309
Mullon, Rev. T. J., 244, 256, *passim*.
Murray, O'Kane, *Popular History of the Catholic Church in the United States*, 284.

Nat. Cath. War Council, first annual report of Com. on Hist. Records, plan for preservation of Catholic war records, 114.
National Progress, 1907–1919, by F. A. Ogg, rev., 409–413.
Neale, (S.J.), Fr., 287.
Neale, Bennett, 289
Neale, Edward, 289.
Nerinckx, Fr., 307.
Neve, Gov., and Lasuen, 146–149.
Nevers, de, 68
New England and the Bavarian Illuminati, by Vernon Stauffer, Ph.D., rev., 265–270.
Newman, *Apologia*, 14.
New Mexico, Arizona and, sketch of diocesan history of, 5–11.
New Orleans, in 1819, 305.
New York, Catholic churches in, 304.
Nicholas, bp. of Gardar, 181, 186.
Nicholas (Michael), bp. of Gardar, 192.

North Carolina, Catholic churches in, 304.
Northern Star, 378.
Notes and Comments: *Am. Cath. historiography*, 282–286; Bohemia Manor, Jesuit graves at, 287–289; Dr. Gabriel's article on the Catholic church in U. S., 115; Hist. Rcds. Com. of N. C. W. C., and plan for preservation of Cath. war records, 114; History of U. S. Army Chaplains, synopsis of plan for, 119; Louvain, recent publications on, 286; Noteworthy articles in current revs., 289; Pastoral on Christian education, Bp. Brossart's, 286–287; Plenary Council in U. S., question of fourth, summary of first three, 115–118; Rooney, LL.D., James A., biog. sketch of, 115; Soc. for Promoting Christian Knowledge *Helps for students of history*, 119; Turner, D.D., Rt. Rev. William, bp. of Buffalo, consecration of, 115.
Notizie varie, of Grassi (S.J.), 301–310.

"Oath of allegiance" (James I), 417.
Oberholtzer, James Paxson, *A History of the United States since the Civil War*," rev., 91–95.
O'Brien, Rev. Mathew, 237, 238.
O'Brien, Rev. (O.P.), William, 226, 227, 238.
O'Cavanagh, Rev. Bernard, 242, 247, 249.
O'Connell, Card., 301.
O'Connor, Rev. Martin, 53.
O'Daniel, (O.P.), S.T.M., Rev. V. F., *Cuthbert Fenwick . . .*, 156–174; on the "Northern Liberties" of Cincinnati, 428–435.
Odin, Fr., 15, 16.
O'Donnell (O.S.F.), Rev. J. L., 392.
O'Flaherty case, and McQuaid, 311.
Of the art both of writing and judging of history, summary, 67–70.
O'Gorman, Bp., *History of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States*, 282, 284.
O'Gorman, Rev. Dr., and first parish church at Utica, N. Y., 42.
Ohio Lit. Soc., 241.
Olaf, bp. of Gardar, 187.
Olaf Trygvesson, 176.
Olivares y Benito, Bp., 9.
Onate, Juan de, 5; *Fr. Escobar's Relation of the Oñate Expedition*, 19–41.
Orozco y Jimenez, Archbp. Francisco, 428.
Ortega, Jose de, 136, 138.

Palou, Francisco, 131–139 *passim*, 148, 154.
Pardo, Alonso, 41.
Parochial schools, and McQuaid, 317–322.
Paul V, 5.
Paul de St. Pierre, the first German-American priest of the west, 195-222: birth and early life, 197; Cahokia incidents, 211–212; Carroll, Bp., and, 202, letters of, about, to Antonelli, 195, to Fr. Gibault, 202; change of name, reason for, 196–197; chaplain in Rochambeau's army, 198–199; diocesan boundaries, Bps. Carroll, Hubert, and 200, 201; exposure of Edgar and Tournier, their charges, 197, 203–204; Fr. Gibault, and 197, 203, 205; letter about, to Bp. Hubert, 200; de La Valinière, charges of, refutation, 205, 208; St. Gabriel's, 221–222, death there, 222; *Pain bénit* custom, 212.
Payet, Fr. Louis, 203; de St. Pierre's letters to, 197–198, 204.
Peñalver y Cardenas, de St.Pierre and, 221.
Pennsylvania, Catholic churches in, 304.
Perry, Ralph Barton, *The Present Conflict of Ideals; a study of the philosophical background of the World War*, rev., 271–274.
Peter a Sancta Andrea, 197.
Peter, bp. of Gardar, 192.
Peter Staras (O.F.M.), bp. of Gardar, 191, 192.
Peyrous (Mr.), 220.
Philip III (Spain), 362.
Philip V, (Spain), 6.
Picpus Fathers, and Vic.-Apost. of Cal., 11, 18.
Pimería Alta, 11, 362.
Pima Indians, 363.
Pise, Rev. C. C. 245.
Pius V, 7.
Pius, VI, 16.
Pius VII, 16.
Pius VIII, 16.
Pius, IX, 11, 18, 314.
Political works of James I, by C. H. McIlwain, rev., 453–459.
Portelles, Mr., 219.
Porto Rico, government in, 412.
Poterie, de la, 305.
Pratte, Mr., 216.
Present Conflict of Ideals, by Ralph Barton Perry, rev., 271–274.
President Adams, and the "Alien law," 379.
Price, Dr., 252.
Priestley, Ph.D., Herbert L., translation of, and introduction to Fages' *An Historical . . . Description of California*, 71–90.
Prince St. Orphan Asylum, N. Y., and Bp. McQuaid, 44.

Protestant Revolution (1689), 158, 171–712.
Public schools and McQuaid, 317–322.
Purcell, Bp., Journal of, 239–256; and his *Diary*, 429–435 *passim*.

Quinn, John, 400.
Quintus Curtius, 68.

Rampolla, Card., and McQuaid, 345–346.
Randolph, (C.M.), Rev. B., and Mother Seton, 222.
Rapin, Fr., 67.
Rascon, Dr., Vic.-Gen. N. M., 9–10.
Rrascon, Francisco, 40, 41.
Redemptioners, status of, in Maryland, 157–158.
Reid, Rev., Bp. Purcell and, 242–250 *passim*.
Rese, Very Rev., Bp. Purcell and, 240, 241, 242, 255.
Reyes, Antony de los, first bp. of Sonora, 16.
Richard, Fr. Gabriel, 307.
Richard Tropez, 215.
Ringman, Bp. Robert, of Gardar, 192.
Riveria, Gov., 139.
Robinson, W. D., *Spanish Friars in the Oregon Country*, 1810–1811, 289.
Rochefoucault de, 68.
Rochester, Bp. McQuaid and the diocese of, 42–43, 311–350.
Romance of Old Philadelphia, The, by John T. Faris, rev., 257–261.
Rooney, LL.D., James A., biog. sketch of, 115.
Rosati, 221, 250, 253, 306; in Illinois, 408.
Rose, Mother, 248.
Roosevelt, Theodore, 131.
Rothensteiner, Rev. John, *Paul de St Pierre. . . .*, 195–222.
Rouset, Bp. Francisco, Lasuen, and 153.
Roux, Benedict, 216.
Rriez, Juan, 41.
Ryan, D. D., Rev. Edwin A., *Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction in the Spanish Colonies*, 3–18, 415.
Ryan, D.D., Rev. John A., 417.

Sacramental purposes, difficulties of securing materials for, in Greenland, 181–182.
St. Benedict, nuns of Order, in early Greenland, 178.
St. Clare, Gov., 204.
St. Cyr, Fr. I. M., 409.
St. Elizabeth's Convent Station, N. Y., and Bp. McQuaid, 48–51.
St. Genevieve, mission, 212, 213–220.
St. James Seminary, Catholic settlement at, 242–243.
St. Pierre, Paul de, 195–222.
St. Ypolito (O.P.), Bartholomew de, bp. of Gardar, 192–193.
St. Xavier's, 256.
Salmeron, Fr. Zarate, *Relaciones . . .*, 19, 22, 24–38 *passim*, 40.
Salneuve (S.J.), Fr., 215.
Salvatierra, 364–376 *passim*.
Sampson, William, 378.
Sandwich Isles (Hawaii), Prefect of, 17.
Santiyusti, Martin de, 40.
Satolli, Card., 338–342; "Fourteen Propositions," of, 340–343.
Schaumberg, Baron de, 198.
Schism, Hogan, 14.
Sebastian de Sancto Paulo, 197.
Señan, Fr. José, *Interrogatorio y respuestas of*, 55–66.
Serra, Junipero, Lasuen, and, 131–146, 154.
Seton Hall College, 46, 47, 48.
Seton, Conversion, Questions Anent Mother E. A., 223–238.
Seton, Msgr. R., and Mother Seton, 225, 228, 237.
Seville, archives at, 427–430.
Sharrock, Bp. (London), 391.
Shea, John Gilmary, 283, 353.
Sigurd, Archbp., 186.
Simeoni, Card., and the school question, 333–340 *passim*.
Sisters of Charity, Bp. McQuaid, and 44–51 *passim*: letters to Mother Xavier, 44, 48, 49–50; (Emmitsburg), 308.
Sisters of Charity of Notre Dame de Namur, *Brief History of the Catholic Church in the United States . . .*, 284.
Sisters of Charity of St. Dominic, (Springfield, Ky.), 308.
Sittensperger (Manners), (S.J.), Fr. Matthias, 196, 287, 288, 289.
Skraelings (Eskimo), 190.
Slaves, de St. Pierre's, 215.
Smith, (Gallitzin), Fr., 196.
Society of United Irishmen, 377.
Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, publications of, 119.
Sourin, 251.
Souvay, (C.M.), D.D., Rev. Charles L., *Questions anent Mother Seton's Conversion*, 223–238.
Spalding, Vincent, 243.
Stanard, Mary Newton, *Colonial Virginia, Its People and its Customs*, rev., 261–263.
Starkey, Fr., 176.
State and Church in Spanish-America, relationship of, 140–142.
Stauffer, Ph.D., Vernon, *New England and the Bavarian Illuminati*, rev., 265–270.
Steinmeyer (Farmer), Fr., Vic.-Gen., 196.
Stillwater system, 346.

Stock, Leo. F., summary of Le-Moyne's *Of the Art both of Writing and Judging of History . . .*, 67–70.
Stonor, Msgr., 382–401 *passim*.
Storer (lawyer), Bp. Purcell and 240, 245, 248.
Strada (S.J.), 68.

Tagle, Francisco Anselmo Sanchez de, 8.
Talbot, Bp. (London), 391.
Tamaron y Romezal, Pedro, conditions in Durango diocese, 8.
Tamarois mission property, de St. Pierre and, 208–211.
Tavannes, 68.
Telegraph, 240–250 *passim*.
Texas, sketch of diocesan history of, 12–15.
Thayer, Rev. John, 391, 436–437.
Thienpont, Rev., 244, 251, 252.
Third Plenary Council, Balto., 324–326.
Tracy, Albert A., *Uncollected Letters of Abraham Lincoln . . .*, rev., 97–99.
Trepsac (O.P.), Rev. F. A., 399.
Tulloh, 396–397.
Tyada, Bp., visitations of, 12–13.

Uncollected letters of Abraham Lincoln, by Gilbert A. Tracy, rev., 97–99.
Ursulines (Bordeaux), 306.
Ursulines (Charlestown), 305.
Utica, Catholic church in, 305.

Valentinus, Sancto Amando, 197.
Valle, Don Francisco de, de St. Pierre and letters, 217–218.
Vancouver, Lasuen and, 151–152.
Vatican council, McQuaid at, 312–316.
Villegas, Pedro Diaz de, 40.
Virgil, 68, 70n.
Virginia, Catholic churches in, 304.
Virginia under the Stuarts (1607–1688), by Thomas J. Wertenbaker, Ph.D., rev., 104–109.
Visitandines, (Georgetown), 308.
Vizcaino, 22, 29.
Von Heiligenstein (de St. Pierre), Paul, 195–222.
Von Schmettau, 196.

Wainwright, Rev., 239, 245.
Warder (sem.), Americus, 244, 245.
Warren, Ratcliff, 165.
Washington, D. C., churches in, 304.
Wash. Hist. Quarterly, *Spanish Friars in the Oregon Country*, 1810–1811, 289.
Wattrin (S.J.), Fr., 215.
Wentworth, Lord, 156.
Wertenbaker, Ph.D., Thomas J., *Virginia under the Stuarts*. (1607-1688), rev., 104–109.
Western Spy, 432.
Westminster diocesan archives, 382–401.
Whelan (O.S.F.), Rev. Charles, 288, 289.
White, Blanco, 14.
White, Dr. C., and Mother Seton, 222, 230, 237; *Sketch of the Origin and Progress of the Catholic Church in the United States*, 282–283.
Williams, Michael, *The Book of the High Romance*, rev., 99.
Williams, Rowland, murder of, 165.
Wilson, (O.P.), Rev. J. T., 432.
Wiseman, Rev. Joseph Vincent, 241.
Wood, LL.D., Edwin O., *Historic Mackinac. The historical, picturesque, and legendary features of the Mackinac Country*, rev., 275–281.
Woodstock Letters, 301–310 *passim*.

Xavier, Mother, letters of Bp. McQuaid to, 44, 48, 49–50.

Young, (S.J.), Benjamin, 172.
Young (O.P.), Nicholas D., and Bp. Purcell, 240, 241, 248, 255, 431.

Zaldivar, Vincente de, 20, 21, 24n.
Zarate, Fr. Salmeron *Relaciones*, . . ., 22, 24–38 *passim*, 40.
Zeller, Fr. Ignatius, 436.
Zubiria y Escalante, Bp. Antonio, religious and political conditions in Durango diocese during administration of, 10-11.
Zumárraga, first bp. of Mexico, example of effects of cooperation of church and state, 4.
Zwierlein, D.Sc., M.H., Rev. Frederick J., *Bishop McQuaid of Rochester* 42–54, 311–352.